Political History of Islam (2)

HISTORY OF THE CALIPHS

From The Death of the Messenger (s) to the Decline of The Umayyad Dynasty 11-132 AH

By:Rasūl Ja'farīan
Translated by:
Ali Ebrahimi

تاریخ سیاسی اسلام (۲)

تاریخ خلفا

(۱۳۲-۱۱ه)

Ansariyan Publications
P . O Box 187
22 Shohada Str. Qom
Islamic Republic Of Iran
Tel:+98 251 7741774 Fax: 7742674
Email: ansarian@noornet.net
www.ansariyan.org
www.ansariyan.net

Graphic Design: Akbari
Tel:+98 251 7748406

HISTORY OF THE CALIPHS

From The Death of the Messenger (s) to the Decline of The Umayyad Dynasty 11-132 AH

Vol.2

By:
Rasūl Ja'farīan

Translated by:
Ali Ebrahimi

Ja'farian, Rasūl, 1965 -
History of the Caliphs: From The Death of the Messenger (s) to the Decline of The Umayyad Dynasty 11-132 AH/ by Rasul Ja'fariyan; translated by Ali Ebrahimi.- Qum: Ansariyan, 2003.
664 P.
Original title: تاریخ خلفا
Including bibliographical references.
ISBN: 964-438-457-1
1. Islām – History – Early to 750. 2. Caliphs, orthodox. 3. Umayyads – History. 4. Caliphate. I.Ebrahimi, Ali tr. II.Title.
297.912 BP14.J3H5

تاریخ خلفا ج۲

HISTORY OF THE CALIPHS

From The Death of the Messenger (s) to the Decline of The Umayyad Dynasty 11-132 AH

Author: Rasūl Ja'farian
Translated by: Ali Ebrahimi
Publisher: Ansariyan Publications – Qum
First Edition 1382 – 1424 - 2003
Negheen Press Quantity: 2000
Number of Pages: 664 Size: 162X229
ISBN: 964-438-457-1

ALL RIGHTS RECORDED AND RESERVED FOR THE PUBLISHER

Ansariyan Publications
P.O. Box 187
22 Shohada St., Qum
Islamic Republic of Iran
Tel: ++89 251 7741744 Fax: 7742647
Email: ansarian@noornet.net
www.ansariyan.org & www.ansariyan.net

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَٰنِ الرَّحِيمِ

IN THE NAME OF ALLAH,
ALL-COMPASSIONATE AND ALL-MERCIFUL

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

ABŪ BAKR'S CALIPHATE 11
SAQĪFA 11
CALIPHATE AFTER THE PROPHET (S) 21
THE ISSUE OF APOSTASY 24
ABŪ BAKR'S AGENTS 34
CONQUEST OF DAMASCUS 38
CONQUEST OF IRAQ 43

CHAPTER II

'UMAR'S CALIPHATE 51
ABOUT CALIPH II 51
THE CALIPH'S CHARACTER 55
'UMAR'S FUNCTIONARIES 59
THOUGHTS OF THE SECOND CALIPH 67
'UMAR'S MURDER 86
CONTINUED CONQUESTS IN DAMASCUS AND EGYPT 91
CONTINUED CONQUESTS IN IRAQ AND THE CONQUEST OF IRAN 97
ABOUT IRAN'S CONQUEST 106

CHAPTER III

'UTHMĀN'S CALIPHATE 111
CALIPHATE COUNCIL AND 'UTHMĀN'S ELECTION 111
'UTHMĀN'S CALIPHATE 123
REASONS OF ANTI-'UTHMĀN REBELLION 125
'UTHMĀN'S OPPONENTS 134
'UTHMĀN'S CONTACT WITH DISSENTERS 142
'UTHMĀN AND MU'ĀWIYA 152
IMĀM 'ALĪ (A) AND 'UTHMĀN 154
ASSASSINATION OF 'UTHMĀN 160
ONGOING VICTORIES 164
EFFECTS OF VICTORIES AND ISLAMIC COMMUNITY 165

CHAPTER IV

IMĀM 'ALĪ'S IMAMATE 173

IMĀM ‘ALĪ ALONGSIDE THE PROPHET 173
IMĀM ‘ALĪ AND CALIPHS 178
SHI‘ISM DURING IMĀM’S CALIPHATE 184
PEOPLE’S ALLEGIANCE TO ‘ALĪ (A) 198
IMĀM’S PROBLEMS 210
REFORMATION, IMĀM’S FUNDAMENTAL POLICY 217
IMĀM IN THE FACE OF INFIDELS (DJAMAL WAR) 223
IMĀM STAYS IN KŪFA 240
WAR WITH OPPRESSIVELY PERVERSE PEOPLE IN ṢIFFĪN 243
WAR WITH EXTREMIST KHĀRIDJITES 270
THE KHĀRIDJITES, FORMATION AND CHARACTERISTICS 276
INVASIONS OF DAMASCUS ARMY 284
IMĀM ‘ALĪ’S MARTYRDOM 292
IMĀM ‘ALĪ’S LIFE 294

CHAPTER V

IMĀM ḤASAN’S IMAMATE 299
ACQUAINTANCE WITH THE KŪFIYĀNS 299
IMĀM ḤASAN’S CHARACTER 303
IMĀM MUDJTABĀ AND IMAMATE 307
FIRST ACTIONS OF IMĀM AND MU‘ĀWIYA 313
MU‘ĀWIYA AND REQUEST FOR COMPROMISE 319
WHY THE COMPROMISE WAS ACCEPTED 320
IMĀM ḤUSAYN (A) AND COMPROMISE 326
PEACE PACT 328
IMĀM MUDJTABĀ’S CHARACTER 333
IMĀM ḤASAN’S MARTYDOM 335

CHAPTER VI

MU‘ĀWIYA’S MONARCHY 339
MU‘ĀWIYA, THE FOUNDER OF THE UMAYYAD MONARCHY 339
SHI‘ITE MUSLIMS IN MU‘ĀWIYA’S TIME 354
THE SUPPRESSION OF ḤUDJR IBN ‘ADĪ’S SHI‘ITES MOVEMENT 363
REPERCUSSIONS OF ḤUDJR’S MARTYRDOM 368
CONQUESTS IN MU‘ĀWIYA’S TIME 370
THE KHĀRIDJITES IN MU‘ĀWIYA’S TIME 372
MU‘ĀWIYA’S ENDEAVOR FOR HEREDITARY CALIPHATE 377

CHAPTER VII

KARBALĀ MOVEMENT 387
IMĀM ḤUSAYN BEFORE KARBALĀ’ 387
IMĀM ḤUSAYN’S OPPOSITION TO YAZĀD’S CALIPHATE 393
DISPATCHING MUSLIM TO KūFA 395
IMāM’S MOVE TOWARDS IRAQ 399
THE PEOPLE OF KūFA AND KARBALā EVENT 401

KŪFA UNDER THE PRESSURE OF IBN ZIYĀD 403
ASSESSING THE TRAVEL TO IRAQ 408
IMĀM VERSUS IRAQI ARMY 415
THE ELEMENT OF INVISIBILITY IN KARBALĀ 423
THE ROLE OF RELIGIOUS DEVIATIONS IN KARBALĀ EVENT 425
POLITICAL IMPACTS OF THE EVENT OF KARBALĀ ON SHI'ISM .. 429

CHAPTER VIII

TRANSFER OF CALIPHATE TO THE MARWĀNIDS 433
DISPUTE BETWEEN ḤIDJĀZ AND DAMASCUS 433
THE BATTLE OF ḤARRA WĀQIM 434
THE PENITENTS' MOVEMENT IN 65 A.H 440
HERE SOME POINTS MERIT ATTENTION AS REGARDS TO THE PENITENTS 447
MUKHTĀR'S UPRISING (66, 67 A.H.) 449

CHAPTER IX

IMĀM SADJDJĀD (A) 465
IMĀM SADJDJĀD(A) 465
IMĀM SADJDJĀD AND SHI'ITE MUSLIMS 471
IMĀM'S ENCOUNTER WITH THE UMAYYADS 476
IMĀM SADJDJĀD'S PROFITING FROM DU'Ā (PRAYER) 479
IMĀM SADJDJĀD AND SLAVES 483
THE HĀSHIMITES AFTER THE EVENT OF KARBALĀ' 485

CHAPTER X

THE MARWĀNIDS' GOVERNMENT 493
ĀL MARWĀN'S RULE 493
ḤADJDJĀDJ IN IRAQ 499
'ABD AL-RAḤMĀN IBN ASH'ATH'S RIOT 504
'UMAR IBN 'ABD AL-'AZĪZ'S ADMINISTRATION 508
ENCOUNTERING THE SHI'ITE MUSLIMS 509
ENCOUNTERING THE KHĀRIDJITES 512
STANDING AGAINST CRUELTY AND PUBLIC EXTORTION 513
YAZĪD IBN 'ABD AL-MALIK'S SUCCESSION 516
YAZĪD IBN MUHALLAB'S UPRISING 518
HISHĀM IBN 'ABD AL-MALIK'S SUCCESSION 522
KHĀRIDJITES' REBELLION IN TIME OF THE MARWĀNIDS 525
THE FOUNDATION OF THE KHĀRIDJITES' PRINCIPLES 531

CHAPTER XI

SHI'ITE MUSLIMS IN THE LAST DECADES OF THE UMAYYAD STATE 535
THE SHI'ITE MUSLIMS UNDER THE PRESSURE OF THE UMAYYADS 535

INTERNAL EVENTS OF SHI'ITE MUSLIMS 538
EXAGGERATION AND THE EXAGGERATORS..... 539
CONFRONTATION OF IMĀMS WITH THE EXAGGERATORS 542
SHI'ISM WHEN GIVING SUPERIORITY TO 'ALĪ (A) 549
ZAYD IBN 'ALĪ'S UPRISING AND THE ZAYDĪDS IN SHI'ISM 557
ZAYD IBN 'ALĪ IN KŪFA 560
ZAYD IBN 'ALĪ'S CLASH WITH THE UMAYYADS' FORCES 566
ZAYDISM, SHI'ISM AND ZAYD IBN 'ALĪ (A) 571
THE TWELVE-IMĀM SHI'ITE MUSLIMS AND ZAYD..... 579
YAḤYĀ IBN ZAYD'S UPRISING 590
'ABD ALLĀH IBN MU'ĀWIYA'S UPRISING..... 593
THE SHI'ITE MUSLIMS AND THE 'ALAWITES' LAST POSITION IN THE UMAYYADS'S TIME..... 597

CHAPTER XII

DECLINE OF THE MARWĀNIDS 601
ḤĀRITH IBN SURAYDJ IN KHURĀSĀN..... 601
THE MURDJI'ITES AND THE DJAHMITES IN ḤĀRITH'S UPRISING 605
WALĪD IBN YAZĪD'S CALIPHATE AND EXTREME CORRUPTION OF THE UMAYYADS..... 607
THE IMPACTS OF WALĪD'S DEATH ON THE UMAYYADS AND THEIR FALL 614
MARWĀN IBN MUḤAMMAD AND THE DECLINE OF THE UMAYYADS 616
POLITICAL VIEWS OF THE MARWĀNIDS..... 619
SCHOLARS SERVE ĀL MARWĀN..... 632
CIRCULATION OF ISRAELITES AND THE PREVALENCE OF STORY-TELLING 636
CONQUESTS BY THE MARWāNIDS UNTIL LATE FIRST CENTURY 642
ORIENTAL CONQUESTS 642
OCCIDENTAL CONQUESTS..... 646
REFERENCES 649

TRANSLATOR'S NOTE

History of Caliphs manifests undeniable facts associated with History of Shiism, the facts every Shiite Muslim and those after Shiism find helpful to achieve on understanding of History of Islam. To this aim, the book is mainly written by the author and printed by the publisher, not to mention the translator, knowing that the task in its entirety is a heavy one with a grave responsibility shouldered upon. Certainly, there exists a mission and function before the Almighty God, his Messenger(s), his progeny and the Shiite followers after, part of which is encumbered here in this historically authentic publication. Motives behind the task are legion and great but whatsoever they may be, they lead every Ahl-e Bayt enthusiast to a long road with unending eternality.

Thanks to divine contributions first, accomplishment of such a heavy task, translation, needs plenty of time, energy, patience, knowledge, faith and aim without each one of which delivery and feasibility seemed improbable. It took a good deal of energy and time excluding other factors to bring this to an end but one thing drove me ahead and that was assistance granted by my Lord who removed all hindrances and obscurities and facilitated the task.

Finally, it is worth mentioning that knowledge, competence and performance are the divine blessings bestowed upon me to fulfil this mammoth task. Be it that the Muslim world and the ensuing generations greatly benefit and transfer it to others.

Diacritics applied in the book for the names come from the latest sources as to the encyclopedia. Any descrepancies shall come under the responsibility of the author of the book.

A. Ebrahimi
Translator

CHAPTER I
ABŪ BAKR'S CALIPHATE

SAQĪFA

It is impossible to study the incidents after the Prophet's demise in connection with the leadership of the society without paying attention to the then political parties in Medina. The Anṣār (Helpers) were one of the important political parties who were worried about problems and their future after the demise of the Prophet (s) since the fall of Mecca to Muslims. They gathered in Saqīfa, fearing the rule of the Quraysh, although they had sworn allegiance to Imām 'Alī (a) – who was, they believed, less probable to assume power. Ḥubāb Ibn Mundhir, one of the influential leaders of Anṣār, in his remarks in Saqīfa, considered the Anṣār better than the Quraysh and said, "It was their sword that gained victory for Islam."

He addressed the Anṣār and said, "These people (Muhādjirūn (Immigrants)) are your booties and your subjects and dare not stand against you."[1] Ḥubāb's words have to mean that whatever made the Anṣār do this unwise act, was their fear from and competition with the Quraysh. On the other hand, a number of the Muhādjirūn who had shown suspicious behavior two weeks before the Prophet's passing, hearing about the Saqīfa gathering, wasted no time in attending the place and arguing with the Anṣār.

The news of the negotiations was revealed later in Medina by the second caliph in one of his sermons. He was in Mecca when he was told that someone had said, "Swearing allegiance to Abū Bakr happened all of a sudden." This made 'Umar very angry and he decided to talk to the people about it in Mecca.

'Abd al-Raḥmān Ibn 'Awf said to 'Umar, "You are in a city where all Arab tribes are present. If you say something now, it will be spread in all cities."

When 'Umar came to Medina, he went to the pulpit and addressed the people, "I have been told that some people have said swearing allegiance to Abū Bakr took place suddenly. I swear by my life that it was so. But God bestowed you its good and protected you against its bad side. After the Prophet's demise, we were told that the Anṣār had gathered with Sa'd Ibn

---

[1] al-Imāma wa l-siyāsa, vol.I, pp.24-25

'Ubāda in the vicinity of Banū Sā'ida. Abū Bakr, Abū 'Ubayda and I went to them and on our way, we came across two men from the Anṣār. They assured us that the Anṣār did not intend to do something contrary to our views, but we decided to see for ourselves."

The spokesman of the Anṣār said, "We, the Anṣār, are the unified army of Islam and you, O Quraysh, were a small group of us and a minority among us!"

I wanted to respond to him but Abū Bakr prevented me and he himself said, "Whatever you say about the Anṣār is, of course, true but the Arabs do not recognize "caliphate" except for the Quraysh race. They are the best of Arabs in lineage and in noble birth. I propose swearing allegiance to 'Umar or Abū 'Ubayda (who were the only men of the Muhādjirūn in the gathering)."

The speaker of Anṣār said, "Let there be an emir from us and another from you."[1]

I responded, "Two swords cannot be put in a scabbard. Then, I raised Abū Bakr's hand and swore allegiance to him."

'Umar added, "The Muhādjirūn and the Anṣār swore allegiance to him. (Of course, there were only three men of the Muhādjirūn in the gathering.) We feared to leave the gathering lest they might swear allegiance to another one and force us to obey him! Or make a tumult with our opposition. Of course, swearing allegiance to Abū Bakr was impromptu, and it was not other than a divine blessing to repel a bad omen from us, and there is no likeness of. Therefore, whoever swears allegiance with a person without "Muslims' consultation", neither he nor the sworn one deserves obedience; otherwise, both will be in danger of assassination."[2]

The caliph gave a brief report on Saqīfa, but it was enough for disclosing part of the realities. The comprehensive report on Saqīfa is available in Abū Bakr Djuwharī's (323 AD) al-Saqīfa.[3]

---

[1] Ḥubāb Ibn Mundhir said that neither Muhādjirūn nor Anṣār accepted each other. Masā'il al-imāma, p.13

[2]. Ibn Abī Shayba, al-Muṣannaf, vol.VII, p.431 ('Umar said, " فمن دعا إلى مثلها فهو الذي لا بيعة له ولا لمن بايعه" "Whoever calls on people do this, neither his allegiance nor that of someone's who calls to his obedience is acceptable." 'Abd al-Razzāq, al-Muṣannaf, vol.V, pp.442-445 (briefly said); Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā, vol.III, p.344; Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.III, pp.204-206; see distorted and disgraceful narrations of 'Umar's speech in, Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.I, p.581

[3]. This book is lost but major part of it is mentioned by Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd in Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha. These quotations have been collected by Muḥammad Hādī Amīnī in a separate book titled "Al-Saqīfa wa Fadak" and published.

Ibn A'tham writes, "Before the arrival of the Muhādjirūn, serious arguments were raised among the Anṣār. One of the Anṣār said, "Select someone whose countenance frightens the Quraysh and makes the Anṣār feel safe." A few proposed Sa'd Ibn 'Ubāda.

Usayd Ibn Ḥuḍayr, one of the nobles of Aws, rose in objection and said, "Caliphate should remain in the Quraysh." Others spoke against him. Bashīr Ibn Sa'd defended the Quraysh and 'Uwaym Ibn Sā'ida said, "Caliphate will be exclusive to the Infallible Household of the Prophet(s). Put it where God has placed it."[1] Ibn A'tham's report shows the internal oppositions inside the Anṣār.

Usayd Ibn Ḥuḍayr from Aws and Bashīr Ibn Sa'd who was Sa'd Ibn 'Ubāda's cousin, were the first men of the Anṣār who swore allegiance to Abū Bakr in Saqīfa. We all know that later on, the Anṣār became dissatisfied with the rule of the Quraysh.

According to Zubayr Ibn Bakkār, the people of Aws said, "It was Bashīr Ibn Sa'd of Khazradj who swore allegiance first. And the people of Khazradj said it was Usayd Ibn Ḥuḍayr." [2]

Abū Bakr knew about such a contention, so in Saqīfa he said, "If the men of Aws assume power, the people of Khazradj will not accept it and there will be bloody fights among them all the time."[3]

According to Ya'qūbī, 'Abd al-Raḥmān Ibn 'Awf, too, was in Saqīfa. This is not true. Whatever Ya'qūbī has quoted from him were told a day later in the mosque.

He addressed the Anṣār and said, "Although you are people of essential excellence but there is no likeness of Abū Bakr, 'Umar and 'Alī (a) among you."

Mundhir Ibn Arqam stood up and said, "We do not deny excellence of the people you named. If one of these people seeks caliphate (he meant Imām 'Alī (a)), there will be no objection to his request." Then Bashīr Ibn

---

[1]. al-Futūḥ, vol.I, pp.3-4; Wāqidī, Kitāb al-ridda, pp.32-33

[2]. al-Muwaffaqiyyāt, p.578; Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, vol.II, p.272. Ḥubāb Ibn Mundhir said to Bashīr Ibn Sa'd in Saqifa, "You swore allegiance to Abū Bakr out of envy towards Sa'd Ibn 'Ubāda (Kitāb al-ridda, p.42). When Usayd Ibn Ḥuḍayr passed away, 'Umar paid off all his debts (al-Fā'iq fī gharīb al-ḥadīth, vol.I, p.108). Ḥubāb Ibn Mundhir composed poem in Saqīfa in reproaching those two men, part of which is so (Kitāb al-ridda, p.38)

سعي ابن حضير في الفساد لجاجة وأسرع منه في الفساد بشير

Ibn Ḥuḍayr much embraced on evil-doings and Bashīr did more than him.

[3]. Nathr al-durr, vol.II, p.14; al-Bayān wa l-tabyīn, vol.III, p.298; al-Imāma wa l-siyāsa, vol.I, p.27; Masā'il al-imāma, p.13

Sa'd and Usayd Ibn Ḥuḍayr rose and swore allegiance; and many followed them so that Sa'd Ibn 'Ubāda was about to be killed in the stampede.[1]

Barā' Ibn 'Āzib went to the The Hāshimites and said, "They swore allegiance to Abū Bakr."

The men of the Hāshimites said Muslims would never do that in their absence. "We are the offspring of Muḥammad (s)!"

'Abbās said, "I swear by the God of Ka'ba, they did."

Ya'qūbī adds, "The Muhādjirūn and the Anṣār had no doubts on Imām 'Alī (a)."[2]

Ṭabarī and Ibn Athīr have said the Anṣār or a number of them present in Saqīfa said they swore allegiance only to 'Alī (a).[3]

According to Ibn Qutayba, Ḥubāb Ibn Mundhir took his sword off its sheath when he saw the Anṣār swearing allegiance but they disarmed him.

He addressed the Anṣār, "You must wait and see your children begging for a bowl of water and a loaf of bread in the doorsteps of the Quraysh."[4]

---

[1]. Sa'd Ibn 'Ubāda never paid allegiance to Abū Bakr and when he was in Damascus, caliph sent somebody to kill him and he was killed; Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.I, p.250

[2]. Tarikh al-ya'qūbī, vol.II, pp.123-124; one of the Anṣār is reported to have said, "If 'Alī and other people of the Hāshimites had not been engaged in burying the Messenger (s) in the house and not been there in worry about him, no one would have had caprice of caliphate, Kitāb al-ridda, pp.45-46. Wāqidī's report reveals that 'Abd al-Raḥmān Ibn 'Awf talked to the Anṣār after Saqīfa event. Evidence of a good number indicates that nobody was present at Saqīfa except three people of Muhādjirūn.

Later on, Bashīr Ibn Sa'd Anṣāri, after hearing of Imām 'Alī's reasoning said to him, "In case people had heard you speaking this way before, nobody would have disagreed with you and all would have paid allegiance to you. But you stayed home and people thought you were not in need of caliphate!

Imām responded, "O son of Bashīr ! Should I have left the Messenger's corpse at home and quarelling with people on succession?"

Abū Bakr said, "They have paid allegiance to me now and if I had known your will, I would have never sought after it myself. You're free to swear allegiance to me."

Imām paid allegiance to him seventy five days after departure of the Messenger (s) when Fāṭima (a) passed away, Kitāb al-ridda, p.47

[3]. Tārikh al-ṭabarī, vol.III, p.208; al-Kāmil fi l-tārikh, vol.II, p.325

[4]. al-Imāma wa l-siyāsa, vol.I, p.27; Kitāb al-ridda, p.42. Ḥarra event, Djuwharī says, in 63 A.H. confirmed what Ḥubāb said to Abū Bakr, "I fear not of you but of those after you (Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, vol.I, p.313). About Anṣār's repentance after Saqīfa, al-Muwaffaqiyyāt, p.583

According to all historians, the most important reasoning of Abū Bakr and 'Umar was Abū Bakr's kinship with the Prophet (s) and his age, although there are some references to his merits in some documents.

They addressed the Anṣār and said, "Arabs will only accept this race of Quraysh[1] and they will never accept prophethood in a family and caliphate in another family." [2]

Abū Bakr in Saqīfa said, نحن قريش والأئمة منا "We are from the Quraysh and the Imāms must be from us."[3]

Later on, when Imām 'Alī (a) expressed his objections to Abū Bakr and 'Umar about how they had relied on "kinship" knowing that he was closer to the Prophet (s), 'Umar said, "Arabs do not want to see prophethood and caliphate in a single family.[4] Prophethood belonged to you, so let the caliphate be for other families!"

There is no doubt that after avoiding allegiance to 'Alī (a) in Saqīfa, tribal opposition began and finally, the Quraysh introduced its "tribal superiority" to make use of the internal conflicts of the Anṣār and win the caliphate despite their limited influence in Medina. Followers of Abū Bakr considered his age as a criterion at a time when Imām 'Alī (a) was young.

Ḥubāb said, "Since we killed their fathers in wars, they would take revenge on us." (Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.I, p.580); al-Fā'iq fī gharīb al-ḥadīth, vol.III, p.166; Masā'il al-imāma, p.135

In this case, we should see how Imām was treated. In Badr, they have murdered half of Quraysh totaling seventy people. Certainly, it has to be known that the Anṣār felt remorseful of what they had done and so they stood against defending 'Alī, Quraysh and its political party, from 'Uthmān and Mu'āwīya to Ṭalḥa, Zubayr and 'Āyisha in Djamal, Ṣiffīn or before by having a hand in 'Uthmān's murder or staying silent towards it. Even a few days after Saqīfa, their remorse was revealed and Ḥassān Ibn Thābit's then poems best prove that. Tarikh al-ya'qūbī, vol.II, pp.127-128

[1]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.I, p.582

[2]. Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, vol.II, p.38

[3]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.I, p.583, والعرب لا ترضى أن يؤمّركم وبينها من غيركم ولكن يؤمرون من كانت فيهم النبوة "Arabs never appoint you as ruler but those who were in touch with prophethood." Kitāb al-ridda, p.39; Abū Bakr in his speech relied on this, " قريش أوسط العرب داراً وأكرمهم أحسابا "The Qurayshites are the most outstanding and noble 'Arab dynasty." Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā, vol.II, p.269; Following above sentence quoted from Abū Bakr, in Nathr al-durr, vol.II, p.13 it is added through Abū Bakr, " وأحسنهم وجوهاً أكثر الناس ولادة في العرب "The most good-looking people were more among those who were given birth among Arabs." Abū Bakr said, نحن قريش والأئمة منا "We are the Qurayshites and Imāms are from us" as a hadith although this was attributed to him later.

[4]. al-Īḍāḥ, p.87. 'Umar said to Ibn 'Abbās, "Your people did not want to have the prophethood and caliphate in your family because, in that case, pride elevated you to the sky; Nathr al-durr, vol.II, p.28

When Salmān heard the news of the allegiance, he said, "You selected the most aged one but made a mistake about the Infallible Household of your prophet. If you swore allegiance to them, two people would not oppose you."[1]

It should be noted that no reliable and documented words were uttered on the issue of Saqīfa and the way of the caliph's selection. Of course, we must ignore the false quotations made up to show Abū Bakr rightful[2] for the caliphate that said the Prophet (s) had chosen not only Abū Bakr, but also the succeeding caliphs.[3] What is important to us, is the Saqīfa talks and the sideline incidents. The Anṣār considered caliphate to themselves; the Muhādjirūn - Abū Bakr, 'Umar and Abū 'Ubayda - went to Saqīfa and said caliphate was exclusive to the Quraysh. They did not rely on any traditions such as "The Imāms are from the Quraysh," and said Arabs would not obey any other race than the Quraysh. Among them, some great companions of the Prophet (s) such as Zubayr and Ṭalḥa[4] did not consider Abū Bakr the right one to assume power.

Therefore, there was no recognized method or preconditions for selecting Abū Bakr except his kinship with the Prophet (s), "tribal superiority" of the Quraysh and tribal criteria. Being from the Quraysh was in no sense a prerequisite for assuming the title of caliph. Many years after his caliphate, 'Umar wished "Sālim" Mawlā Ḥudhayfa Ibn Yamān were alive

---

[1]. al-Saqīfa wa Fadak, p.43; Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, vol.II, p.49 and Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.I, p.590; Abū 'Ubayda Djarrāḥ talked about 'Alī's younghood when Imām objected, Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, vol.II, pp.2-5

[2]. 'Āyisha is quoted to have been questioned, "Whom did the Messenger (s) find as his successor?"

"Abū Bakr", she replied.

"Who would be his successor?", she was asked.

"'Umar", she answered.

"And after 'Umar", she was questioned.

"Abū 'Ubayda Djarrāḥ", she replied.

(Ibn Abī Shayba, al-Muṣannaf, vol.VII, p.433)

The date of forging this hadith shall be found within the hadith proper.

[3]. al-Ghadīr, vol.V (issue, Silsilat al-Mawḍū'āt fi l-khilāfa) pp.333-356. According to Waqidī in al-Ridda (pp.35-37) it seems that the Messenger (s) has placed Abū Bakr as his successor as clarified in Saqīfa several times!

[4]. Nihāyat al-'irab, vol.XIX, p.39

to rule after him.[1] Sālim was not a man of the Quraysh. Some believe that the prerequisite of being from the Quraysh by descent was introduced in the Sunnites political jurisprudence since the third century.[2] The only criteria in Saqīfa were linkage to the Quraysh and Abū Bakr's age. These were the only criteria of the Dark Age along with the political conflicts that granted him caliphate, not a combination of the pagan and Islamic criteria that Dr. Khayr al-Dīn Sawī has stated.[3] There are other documents at hand that Abū Bakr attached special significance to the Quraysh and its nobility.

Ibn 'Asākir says, "Some time after the conversion of Abū Sufyān to Islam; Bilāl; Ṣuhayb Rūmī, and Salmān scorned him. Abū Bakr asked angrily why they behaved that way with "the Shiykh and master of the Quraysh". They complained about this in the presence of the Prophet (s) and he asked Abū Bakr to apologize.[4]

After the allegiance in Saqīfa, they left the place. According to Barā' Ibn 'Āzib, they walked in the alleys and rubbed the hands of whoever they met to Abū Bakr's hands, not paying attention to the person's willingness or unwillingness.

Bara' adds, "I rushed to the door of the Hāshimites to give the news."[5] Their interest in allegiance was so immense that according to Ibn Abī Shayba, they did not attend the funeral ceremony of the Prophet (s) and returned to the city after the ceremony.[6]

Finishing the allegiance swearing, 'Umar stood up and apologized for whatever he had said the day before on the continuation of the Prophet's life until the death of his last companion, and indeed for his claim on offering guidance to the Prophet (s). He said he believed that the Prophet (s) would

---

[1]. Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, vol.I, p.190; al-'Iqd al-farīd, vol.II, p.274, vol.III, p.407; Tārīkh al-madīnat al-munawwara, vol.II, p.881; Masā'il al-imāma, p.63; Mukhtaṣar Tārīkh Dimashq, vol.XII, p.69

[2]. Taṭawwur al-fikr al-siyāsī 'Ind ahl al-Sunna, p.38

[3]. Taṭawwur al-fikr al-siyāsī, p.38, footnote IV

[4]. Mukhtaṣar Tārīkh Dimashq, vol.V, p.261

[5]. al-Saqīfa wa Fadak, p.46

[6]. Ibn Abī Shayba, al-Muṣannaf, vol.VII, p.432

Hishām Ibn 'Urwa quotes his father, ان ابا بكر وعمر لم يشهدا دفن النبي (ص) وكانا في الانصار فدفن قبل ان يرجعا Abū Bakr and 'Umar were with the Anṣār when the Prophet (s) was to be buried, and before they came back, the Prophet (s) had been buried

Wāqidī says, "What seems correct to me is that the Prophet (s) has been buried Saturday. (al-Bad' wa l-tārīkh, vol.V, p.47); therefore, it is clear that Abū Bakr and his fellow had been busy since Monday till tomorrow when the Prophet (s) passed away and they could not come by his dead body. These two people are hardly mentioned among those named in reports concerned with his burial.

live long to organize the affairs, but now he witnessed that the Qur'ān was left among them and the people swore allegiance to the best companion of the Prophet (s).[1] This shows that 'Umar was waiting for the selection of the anticipated caliph and he had no problem after that.

Some people rose in objection. In addition to two distinguished personalities of the The Hāshimites, i.e. Imām 'Alī (a) and 'Abbās, there were some other influential people such as Zubayr Ibn 'Awām, Khālid Ibn Sa'īd, Miqdād Ibn 'Amr, Salmān, Abūdhar, 'Ammār, Barā' Ibn 'Āzib, and Ubayy Ibn Ka'b.[2]

Abū Bakr's followers went to visit Ubayy Ibn Ka'b but he did not open the door for them.[3] 'Umar, Abū 'Ubayda Djarrāḥ, Mughīra Ibn Shu'ba and Khālid Ibn Walīd were the chief organizers of this program. At Imām 'Alī's doorstep, 'Umar severely and seriously asked him to swear allegiance to Abū Bakr.

Imām said, "Your greed for Abū Bakr's rule today is to have the caliphate tomorrow."[4]

Those who had gathered in Imām 'Alī's house faced the harsh behavior of 'Umar and his followers. 'Umar took Zubayr's sword and broke it, then threatened the residents of the house that he would set the house on fire. For the list of those sitting in Imām 'Alī's house and the names of those who broke into the house, refer to the following sources.[5]

According to Ibn 'Abd Rabbih, 'Umar who had a brand of fire in his hand, threatened to set the house on fire. When Fāṭima (a) asked him whether he was serious, he said he was unless they accepted whatever the nation had accepted.[6] Fāṭima asked the sit-in people to disperse because she was sure 'Umar would set the house ablaze.[7]

---

[1]. al-Bad' wa l-tārīkh, vol.IV, pp.65-66

[2]. Tarīkh al-ya'qūbī, vol.II, p.124

[3]. al-Saqīfa wa Fadak, p.47

[4]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.I, p.587. According to Ibn Qutayba, 'Alī said to him, "Milk in a way you can have part of it; al-Imāma wa l-siyāsa, vol.I, p.29

[5]. Ma'ālim al-madrisatayn, vol.II, pp.163-166; Talkhīṣ al-shāfī, pp.76, 156

[6]. al-'Iqd al-farīd, vol.III, p.64; Tārīkh 'Abi l-fidā', vol.I, p.156 quoted from, Ma'ālim al-madrisatayn, vol.II, p.167

About other sources talking about threat, Ma'ālim al-madrisatayn, vol.II, pp.167-168

Abū Bakr in his time of death was concerned about a few things, one was that he wished he had never opened Fāṭima's house door even if they had closed it with the aim of war (Ma'ālim al-madrisatayn,, vol.II, p.165, footnote LXV from various sources)

[7]. al-Mudhakkar wa l-tadhkīr wa l-dhikr, p.91; Ibn Abī Shayba, al-Muṣannaf, vol. VII, p.432

Getting allegiance by force and threatening to set the house on fire, which were followed later on by the other caliphs (such as Ibn Zubayr in his exacting allegiance from the Hāshimites) [1] could have stemmed from here.

Of course, the Quraysh started talks in addition to using force. Upon Mughīra's advice, they went to 'Abbās to include him and his family, too, in the allegiance move and alleviate their problems by pleasing the Prophet's uncle, but 'Abbās rejected their invitation.[2]

Amīr al-Mu'minīn and Fāṭima did their best to return the right of caliphate from Abū Bakr to Imām 'Alī (a) but it was fruitless. Their efforts have been recorded in the books of Abū Bakr Djuwharī and others.[3] There is no doubt that Fāṭima (a) was angry with Abū Bakr and 'Umar for trampling on her right in the issue of the Prophet's heritage, the Fadak case[4] and the Imamate of Muslims and she passed away sore in the heart.[5]

Zuhrī says, "Imām 'Alī (a) buried Fāṭima's body at night and did not let Abū Bakr know it. Until before her death, Imām 'Alī (a) and none of the Hāshimites men swore allegiance to Abū Bakr.[6] Later on, Imām 'Alī (a) swore allegiance to protect the unity of Muslims against the idolaters and infīdels."[7]

In his response to Abū Sufyān's request who asked him not to let caliphate remain in the hands of the Banū Tayım, Imām 'Alī said, "You have always been an enemy of Islam and Muslims."[8]

At any rate, there is no doubt that Imām 'Alī (a) did not swear allegiance to Abū Bakr until after the death of Fāṭima (a).[9]

The Shi'ite Muslims believed in such an action.

1. Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, vol.XX, p.147

2. Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, vol.I, p.220; Tarīkh al-ya'qūbī, vol.II, pp.124-125

3. Tarīkh al-ya'qūbī, vol.II, p.126; Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, vol.II, pp.5-28 and 67; Waq'at al-ṣiffīn, p.182; Kitāb al-ridda, p.46

4. About what happened to Fadak during the Umayya and the 'Abbāsids, al-Kharādj wa Ṣanā'at al-kitāba, pp.259-260

5. 'Abd al-Razzāq, al-Muṣannaf, vol.V, p.472. The same quotation comes from Zuhrī in Bukhārī, vol.VI, p.122.Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, vol.VI, pp.49-50; vol.XVI, pp.253,281,282; al-Bidāya wa l-Nihāya, vol.V, pp.285,287

6. 'Abd al-Razzāq, al-Muṣannaf, vol.V, p.472

7. It was for the same reason Imām opposed to Abū Sufyān who had been willing to pay allegiance to Imām, Nathr al-durr, vol.I, p.400

8. Nihāyat al-'irab, vol.XIX, p.40

9. Aside from false narrations against the chronicles, Imām swore allegiance just when 'Umar and Abū Bakr stopped by him in his house, Nihāyat al-'irab, vol.XIX, pp.39,40

Madā'inī has written that with the beginning of the war against the infidels, 'Uthmān came to Imām 'Alī (a) and said, "No one will join you in your fight against infidels unless you swear allegiance to Abū Bakr." He insisted and took Imām to Abū Bakr's place and 'Alī (a) swore allegiance and it made Muslims very happy.[1]

Mas'ūdī says, "Fāṭima, sitting at the side of the Prophet's grave, recited the following poem",

قدكان بعدك انباء وهينمة لوكنت شاهدها لم تكثر الخطب[2]

"After you, there appeared events that if you had been alive to see them, you would have never made so many speeches."

Fāṭima's opposition was very important to the caliph as far as his public prestige was concerned. Abū Bakr did his best to come to terms with her but she never accepted. This made the caliph express his deep regret in the final years of his life for invading Fāṭima's house. Many historians have quoted him as wishing he had never inspected Zahrā's house.[3]

Sa'd Ibn 'Ubāda was another opponent of Abū Bakr.[4] He did not swear allegiance with Abū Bakr and went to Damascus, and as has been quoted, was assassinated there in the time of the second caliph. The common news in historical documents is that genies killed him and they composed two verses on this. But, fact according to Balādhurī and Ibn 'Abd Rabbih, is that a man from Damascus was sent by 'Umar to ask him to swear allegiance and when 'Ubāda did not accept, he killed him.[5]

Abū Bakr's policy differed from that of 'Umar in that 'Umar believed in using force to get allegiance from his opponents, but Abū Bakr did not recommend it although he also believed in this principle. Both had dual policies but 'Umar, according to authentic documents, used force while Abū Bakr said in one of his sermons, "لا بيعة لي في عنقه وهو بالخيار من أمره" "'Alī has no

---

[1]. Talkhīṣ al-shāfī, vol.III, p.77

[2]. Murūdj al-dhahab, vol.II, p.304; Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, vol.II, p.50, vol.VI, p.43, vol.XVI, pp.212, 251; al-Bad' wa l-tārikh, vol.V, pp.68-69, there, "Wahaynama" is replaced with "Wahanbatha"; in addition, another line is added too.

[3]. Ḥayāt al-ṣaḥaba, vol.II, p.24; Kanz al-'Ummāl, vol.V, No.14113; Ibn Sallām, al-Amwāl, p.194

[4]. Nihāyat al-'irab, vol.XIX, p.38; it is cited there a group of Khazradjīs failed to pay allegiance in Saqīfa.

[5]. al-Mi'yār wa l-Muwāzana, p.232 (quoted from Balādhurī and Ibn 'Abdirabbih in the footnote). Interestingly, Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd (XVII, 223-224) says that some knew Abū Bakr as his murderer but he has not found a historical report concerningly. This is while the aforesaid report is cited in two historical sources, of course about caliph II.

obligation or commitment to swear allegiance to me and he is free in his choice."[1]

CALIPHATE AFTER THE PROPHET (S)

Abū Bakr, son of Abū Quḥāfa, was the first caliph after the Prophet's demise. There are different views on his name being 'Abd Allāh or 'Atīq.[2] Apparently, they have insisted on saying that his name was 'Abd Allāh but he used to be called 'Atīq. He belonged to the Banū Taym tribe, one of the tribes of the Quraysh. During the Dark Age, the tribe had no special standing among the other tribes. A solid evidence for this claim is Abū Sufyān's words when Abū Bakr assumed power.

He said, "How come the government has fallen to the least populated and meanest tribes of the Quraysh?"[3]

There is a story that says one day, Abū Bakr was speaking with Dhaghfal about his lineage and both agreed that Banū Taym was one of the weakest tribes of the Quraysh.[4] Another time, Abū Bakr asked Qays Ibn 'Āṣim why he buried his daughters alive.

He replied, "So that they do not give birth to children like you."[5]

There are different views also on his occupation in the days of ignorance. Those who intended to attribute a high position to him in the Dark Age, said he was a merchant. On the other hand, there are documents that say he had menial jobs such as milking and the like.[6] Another story says Abū Bakr had financial problems and was a teacher in the Dark Age and later, became a tailor after the advent of Islam.[7]

Two years younger than the Prophet of Islam, he is believed to be one of the first Muslims, although there are conflicting ideas on whether he was the first or the fifty-first Muslim as one quotation has it.[8] Such notions about him, who was the first caliph, are natural. We have not heard about any special pressures he may have faced in the years of invitation to Islam in Mecca. He did not accompany the Muhādjirūn to Abyssinia, but he found an

---

1. al-Sīrat al-ḥalabiyya, vol.III, p.389 (al-Ghadīr, vol.V, p.368)

2. al-Ma'rifa wa l-tārikh, vol.I, p.238, Murūdj al-dhahab, vol.II, p.298

3. 'Abd al-Razzāq, al-Muṣannaf, vol.V, p.451; Mustadrak, vol.II, p.78

4. Madjma' al-amthāl, vol.I, p.27

5. Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, vol.XIII, p.177

6. al-Fā'iq fī gharīb al-ḥadīth, vol.IV, p.12

7. al-Ifṣāḥ, p.176

8. al-Ṣaḥīḥ Min Sīra al-Nabī, vol.I, pp.247,289,290; Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, (vol.II, p.60), in a weakened narration by Himself, says that fifty people embraced Islam before Abū Bakr.

opportunity to be with the Prophet (s) in the night of Ḥidjra. According to our discussions about Ḥidjra, after the Prophet left the house, Abū Bakr went to see Imām 'Alī (a) and when found out that Prophet Muḥammad (s) had gone, he set off and joined him.

Abū Bakr's relations with the Prophet (s) grew stronger after the Prophet's marriage with 'Āyisha. 'Āyisha was a clever woman who tried to have a role in all political developments of her time. This helped strengthen Abū Bakr's position to some extent. We said earlier that 'Alī (a) believed that 'Āyisha played the key role in Abū Bakr's prayers.

Abū Bakr did not have any political or military responsibility during his ten years of stay in Medina, but he could gain power by understanding the situation of the internal wings of the Quraysh and taking advantage of the Quraysh's enmity towards Imām 'Alī (a) as well as the collaboration of the middle wings of the Quraysh, those who were not among the Umayyads and the Hāshimites.

Abū Bakr grasped a serious chance. When he took over the caliphate, a wave of apostasy and opposition to Islam swept across Ḥidjāz and Muslims who all saw the principle of Islam endangered realized that opposing Abū Bakr was not to their interests. It is interesting to know that immediately after Abū Bakr's coming to power, rifts emerged between the Anṣār and the Quraysh over a sarcastic poem composed by Abū Bakr about the Anṣār. Afterwards, the Anṣār kept some distance from Abū Bakr and 'Amr Ibn 'Āṣ, instigated by the Quraysh spoke against them. On the other hand, Faḍl Ibn 'Abbās and then, Imām 'Alī (a) praised the Anṣār. Ḥassān Ibn Thābit composed poems in praise of Imām 'Alī (a) for his support of the Anṣār and implicitly, referred to the efforts of some men of the Quraysh who wanted to take Imām 'Alī's position.[1] However, when oppositions heightened, the Anṣār moved towards the claimants of prophethood and other apostates.

About Abū Bakr, we have to admit that he had an eloquent language and we are sure that it was his clam words at the Saqīfa more effective than 'Umar's harsh words, though they were complementary.

Later, Abū Bakr once pointed to his tongue and said, "This is what helped me reach this rank."[2]

Abū Bakr reiterated several times that there were some people who deserved the caliphate more than him. After the people swore allegiance to him, he said in a sermon, "I took over the rule over you while I'm not any better than you. If I behave well, help me; if not, guide me. Obey me as long

---

[1]. Tarikh al-ya'qūbī, vol.II, p.128

[2]. Nathr al-durr, vol.II, p.13

as I am obedient to God; otherwise, you won't need to obey me."[1] This shows that Abū Bakr believed it was not necessary for a ruler to be the best of the people.

He has been quoted as saying, " 'Umar is stronger than me and Sālim is more pious."[2] But his emphasis on having the rule is surprising. Abū Bakr introduced his government as the "Caliphate of Prophethood" to convey the religious aspect of his caliphate. He considered his rule not as a caliphate from God, but a succession to the Prophet (s) and named himself the "Caliph of the Messenger of Allāh".[3]

His first measure was dispatching Usāma's army, an army that the Prophet (s) had prepared to send to Damascus in the final days of his life. Some political opposition caused delays in the deployment of the army under the pretext of Usāma's young age. But now that the issues seemed to have been settled, the same people who were opposed, decided to send Usāma's army in spite of the critical situation on Ḥidjāz. Responding to opposition against the army's dispatch, they said they could not ignore doing something that the Prophet had wanted. Abū Bakr said he would send the army even if the beasts would tear him apart in Medina.[4] Usāma's army left for Damascus and returned after forty days with no serious clashes. Since the Prophet (s) had included 'Umar in Usāma's army, Abū Bakr asked Usāma to let 'Umar stay with him.

---

[1]. 'Abd al-Razzāq, al-Muṣannaf, vol.XI, p.326; Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.III, p.336; al-Imāma wa l-siyāsa, vol.I, p.34

[2]. Nathr al-durr, vol.II, p.15

[3]. Abūya'lā, al-Aḥkām al-sulṭāniyya, p.17. Despite what is said, caliph I, in his first oration, said, وقد استخلف الله عليكم خليفة God hath ordained a caliph to unify thee and to strengthen thy words, Al-Imāma wa l-siyāsa, vol.I, p.34. Damascus Muslims are quoted to have called Abū Bakr as "God's Caliph".

Al-Imāma wa l-siyāsa, vol.I, p.38 (Damascus people were expected to say this but nothing else). Once he was called "God's Viceroy", but he said, "I'm not vicegerent of God, I am caliph of the Prophet (s) and I am pleased with it! (Ibn Abī Shayba, al-Muṣannaf, vol.VII, p.433)

'Adī Ibn Ḥātam told Abū Bakr, "We obeyed God's Messenger (s) because of his obedience and you are obeyed for you obey the Propher (s) (Kitāb al-ridda, p.66). His intention lies in the same word of caliph.

[4]. Tārīkh khalīfat Ibn khayyaṭ, pp.100-101

THE ISSUE OF APOSTASY

The main problem of Muslims was a move known as "Apostasy". According to historians, after the Prophet's passing, some people claimed prophethood, some became apostates and put on the royal crown while others refused to pay their tax alms.

We all know that the Bedouin Arabs converted to Islam one after another following the conquest of Mecca. It was mostly due to the ever-expanding power of Islam and they feared that Muslims would confront them any time. Therefore, they had no way but accepting the new path, even if temporarily while they did not know enough about Islam, nor could they give up their old ideas of the Dark Age.

Another serious problem for them was paying the tax alms. In fact, they considered it an act of extortion by Muslims, muslims to them were only the people of the Quraysh, Aws and Khazradj. These currents each had its own motive, but the system of caliphate viewed all of them as apostasy and confronted them from this aspect. However, apostates can be classified into several groups given what has been said so far,

The first group was those who claimed prophethood. Some others gave up Islam and returned to their previous faith during the Dark Age. The third group did not recognize the Medina government, but said they abided by Islam. These people did not believe in the Medina administration so refused to pay tax alms. Among this group, there were people who did not recognize Abū Bakr's rule and did not believe in the Imamate of Prophet's Household, so they did not pay tax alms. Here, we will first discuss the claimants of prophethood.

The news of apostasy has been brought up in several books. Ṭabarī has used Sayf Ibn 'Umar's book as his major source. His book was "al-Futūh al-Kabīr wa al-Radda". Biographers have all rejected Sayf's authenticity.[1] Another independent work is the book of al-Futūh by Ibn A'tham Kūfī that fortunately remains to date. Wāqidī and Madā'inī had both books on apostasy. More recently, Wāqidī's "al-Radda" was published. It has many commonalties with the al-Futūh of Ibn A'tham. There are other sparse and scattered references to apostasy in other books.

As for the claimants of prophethood, there was a main motive. Some ambitious tribes or individuals thought that they could also rule others by claiming prophethood if others had done so. This move led to the emergence of many claimants of prophethood. Aswad 'Ansā was the first of these who staged a rebellion in Yemen and wrote to the representatives of the Prophet,

---

[1]. 'Abd Allāh Ibn Saba', in his book, deals with narrations of the same person by considering narrations of Sayf by 'Allāma 'Askarī.

""أمسكوا علينا ما أخذنا من أرضنا" "Return to us whatever of our lands you have captured."[1]

Hearing this, Prophet Muḥammad (s) ordered him to be killed in "any way possible". It took three months for Muslims to quell the Aswad mutiny and he was killed finally. It is said that the news of his death reached Medina a few days after the demise of the Prophet (s). An Iranian-born man named Fīrūz, belonging to the Yemenī tribe of Abnā', had killed 'Ansā.[2] There is also another reference to another Muslim named Dādhwayh who seems to be an Iranian.

Musaylima Ibn Ḥabīb from the Banū Ḥanīfa tribe was another claimant of prophethood. He visited the Prophet of Islam in Medina along with the influential men of his tribe and said to have converted to Islam.

But, upon his return, he thought about claiming prophethood and said to the people of Banū Ḥanīfa, "I what to know how come the Quraysh is more deserving than you for caliphate and Imamate? I swear by God that their population is not more than yours. They are not braver than you. You have more lands and more properties."[3]

Then, he claimed prophethood and wrote to the Prophet of Islam, "I have become your partner in prophethood. Half of the lands belong to us and the other half to the Quraysh, but the Quraysh are aggressive people." The Prophet responded to him,

إِنَّ الْأَرْضَ لِلَّهِ يُورِثُهَا مَنْ يَشَاءُ مِنْ عِبَادِهِ وَالْعَاقِبَةُ لِلْمُتَّقِينَ.

"The earth belongs to Him, He gives it to whomever He wishes and the eternality is for the pious people."[4]

This correspondence took place at the end of the 10th year from Ḥidjra. When the Messenger of Allāh passed away, Musaylima found an opportunity to gather some followers around himself. He used to compose rhythmic prose to imitate the Qur'ān and recited the prose for his followers.[5] Furthermore, he had told people he had exempted them from saying morning and evening prayers.[6] Also, Sadjāḥ, the daughter of Ḥārith Tamīmī[7], claimed prophethood but after meeting Musaylima, she married

---

[1]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.II, p.229

[2]. Tārīkh khalīfat Ibn khayyaṭ, p.117

[3]. al-Futūḥ, vol.I, p.23

[4]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.II, p.149; al-Kharādj wa Ṣana'a al-kitāba, p.282

[5]. For example, لا اقسم بهذا البلد، ولا تبرح هذا البلد، حتى تكون ذا مال وولد، ووفر وصفد وخيل وعدد، الى آخر الابد، علي رغم من حسد Kitāb al-ridda, p.111; and another example in, al-Bad' wa l-tārīkh, vol.V, pp.161-162,164. These cases are morally ill.

[6]. al-Bidāya wa l-nihāya, vol.VI, p.326

[7]. In some sources, she is called daughter of Aws Ibn Ḥurayz, Djamharat al-nasab, p.226

him. It is said that as Sadjāḥ's marriage portion, he exempted the people from saying morning and evening prayers.

In al-Futūḥ we read that when Sadjāḥ met Musaylima, she said, "I heard about your excellent traits and chose you. I have come to be your wife so that we can both be prophets, and together, make the world obey us and be our subordinate."

Musaylima said, "For your marriage portion, I exempted your nation from saying prayers at dawn and dusk."[1]

When Muslims went to Yamāma with an army led by Khālid Ibn Walīd, they came across some of Musaylima's followers and asked them what faith they were in.

They said, "منا نبي ومنكم نبي" "We have our prophet and you have your prophet."

It was then that a war broke out between them. The Yamāma battle was one of the bloodiest wars of Muslims with claimants of prophethood and apostates. In this war, the Muslim army lost a great number of its men, 58 of whom were from the Muhādjirūn and the Anṣār and 13 men out of them, had fought in the Battle of Badr.[2] Ibn A'tham has put the number of Muslim martyrs at 1200 people, 700 of whom had memorized the Qur'ān.[3] In a text attributed to Wāqidī, we read the details about the war and the many pre-battle bragging of the Prophet's companions, including 'Ammār Yāsir. Immediately after the battle ended, Khālid married Mudjā'a Ibn Marāra's daughter, who was one of the conspiring heads of Banū Ḥanīfa, and indulged in his own lust and pleasure. Observing this, Muslims wrote a letter to Abū Bakr and said,

أترضى بأنا لا تجف دماءنا وهذا عروس باليمامة خالد

"Do you please with our blood in dryness and this man keeps on living in relief in Yamāma."

The news reached Abū Bakr and 'Umar said, "Khālid always does something which pains our heart." Abū Bakr wrote a strong-worded letter to Khālid. When Khālid read the letter, he laughed and said he was sure it was 'Umar's work because he knew Abū Bakr was satisfied with him.[4]

Another claimant of prophethood was Ṭulayḥa Ibn Khuwaylad Asadī. He also gathered men from the tribes of Ghaṭafān and Banū Fazāra and tried

---

[1]. al-Futūḥ (Persian translation), p.20-21; al-Bad' wa l-tārikh, vol.V, p.165

[2]. Tārikh khalīfat Ibn khayyaṭ, vol.I, pp.111-115

[3]. al-Futūḥ, vol.I, p.40

[4]. al-Futūḥ, vol.I, p.43-44; Kitāb al-ridda, pp.144-146

to compose rhythmic prose to claim prophethood and stand against the Medina government.

In a battle between his men and the Muslim's army, 'Uyayna Ibn Ḥiṣn and his tribesmen from Banū Fazārah were defeated heavily and Ṭulayḥa fled to Damascus. Thus, another revolt was suppressed.[1] 'Uyayna Ibn Ḥiṣn had repeatedly shown his enmity towards Islam during the life of the Prophet (s) but had finally embraced Islam. However, his presence in this current showed that he, like many others, had never believed in Islam truly. When he was brought as a captive to Medina, people taunted him and said, "O, enemy of God! Did you become an infidel after converting to Islam?" But he swore he had not believed in Islam even for a moment.[2] Abū Bakr pardoned the captives of this war. Ṭulayḥa, too, came to Medina at the time of 'Umar and repented.

'Umar told him, "How do you expect to save yourself from hell when you have killed Thābit Ibn Arqam Anṣārī and 'Ukkāsha Ibn Miḥṣan Asadī?"

Ṭulayḥa said, "God had wanted martyrdom for them and I did not kill them with my own hand, so there will be no hell for me." 'Umar liked his reasoning and pardoned him.

Apart from claimants of prophethood, some other tribes became apostates in the basics. There is no doubt that the situation was prepared for apostasy but it is not clear for sure who were the real apostates and who are those who did not accept the Medina government merely for political or religious reasons.[3] For example, one such group was Mālik Ibn Nuwayra's clan who were accused and killed mercilessly undoubtedly just because of Khālid's personal issues and his mean moral motives. This is a blot of shame for Khālid and those who defended him. They considered his crime in massacring a number of Muslims and his adultery with Mālik's wife after her husband's murder as a wrong interpretation of Idjtihād.[4] Hearing about this, 'Umar was seriously incited against Khālid and asked Abū Bakr to oust him but the caliph called him the "sword of God" and refused to do so.[5]

Among the tribes considered to be apostate, there were some people who did not believe in Abū Bakr's caliphate and favored the government of the

---

[1]. al-Futūḥ, vol.I, pp.14-15; Tārīkh khalīfat Ibn khayyaṭ, pp.102-103

[2].Al-Futūḥ,ol.I,p.17; Tārīkh al-ya'qūbī, ol.II,p.129

[3].The Shi'ite Muslims disagreed on saying that all people hae been atheist rebels. Kanz al-fawā'id, vol.II, p.346

[4]. Tārīkh khalīfat Ibn khayyāṭ, p.105, Abū Bakr was told هل يزيد خالد على ان يكون تأول فأخطأ Does Khālid want to express and go wrong Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.II,p.278; Ṭabaqāt al-shu'arā',p.48

[5]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī,vol.II,p.279, al-Aghānī,vol.xv,p.302

Prophet's Household. They said Abū Bakr had no "allegiance" to them so there was no need to obey him. They believed that the Muhādjirūn and Anṣār had prevented the Prophet's Household from coming to power out of jealousy.[1] According to Wāqidī and Ibn A'tham, a clan from Kinda in Ḥaḍramawt was all apostates. Ziyād Ibn Lubayd was responsible for collecting tax alms in the region. Some men of the tribe agreed with paying tax alms while others did not. Once Ziyād chose a camel belonging to Ziyād Ibn Mu'āwiya as tax alms, he asked for help from one of the influential men of Kinda named Ḥāritha Ibn Surāqa and asked him to return his camel and take another one. Ḥāritha made the request from Ziyād but he did not accept. So, Ḥāritha himself went among the camels set aside as tax alms and brought back Zayd's camel, saying, "We obeyed the Messenger of God as long as he was alive." "لو قام رجل من أهل بيته لأطعناه" "Today, we will obey anyone from his Household who comes to power." Abū Bakr has no right of rule and allegiance upon us.

It is said that Ziyād Ibn Lubayd fled from the region overnight and composed poems terming the tribe as apostate.

He said, "We will fight you to make you obey Abū Bakr until you give up infidelity and apostasy and say you shall never return to infidelity."

Of course, not all tribesmen thought like Ḥāritha. What is important is that all of them refused to pay tax alms to the Medina government because they considered it humiliation for themselves. They believed in distributing tax alms among the poor in their tribe.

Some people of this tribe used to say, "We swear by God that we have come to be enslaved by the Quraysh. Once, they send Muhādjir Ibn Abī Umayya or Ziyād Ibn Lubayd to collect tax alms. Then, they threaten to fight against us."[2]

Ash'ath Ibn Qays, from this tribe, said, "I don't think Arabs would accept the rule of the Banū Taym and leave the men of the Hāshimites."

He said in his poems, "If the Quraysh are to leave the power into the hands of Banū Taym and distance themselves from Muḥammad's Household, of course, we are prior to it because we are the descendants of kings."

Elsewhere in the above narration, we read that Ziyād sent the tax alms camels to Medina along with someone and he, himself, went to a tribe of Kinda named Banū Zuhal.

---

[1]. al-Futūḥ,vol.I,pp.58,60 and 61; al-Ridda,pp.171,176 and 177 والله ما ا زلتموها عن أهلها الاّ حسدا منكم لهم By God you seized caliphate away from them just out of envy

[2]. al-Ridda,pp.169-174

An influential man of Kinda named Ḥārith Ibn Mu'āwiya said, "O, Ziyād! You ask us to obey someone who has no accord with us."

Ziyād said, "You are right. He has signed no agreement with you, but we have selected him to rule."

Ḥārith asked, "Why did you take the government away from the Prophet's Household when they deserved it, because God has said, " وَأُولُوا الْأَرْحَامِ بَعْضُهُمْ أَوْلَى بِبَعْضٍ فِي كِتَابِ اللَّهِ." "Some relatives are given more priority over others."

Ziyād answered, "The Muhādjirūn and the Anṣār know the interests of their government better than you."

Ḥārith stated, "I swear by God, it is not so. You did it out of your jealousy. I cannot accept that the Messenger of Allāh has passed away without assigning a successor for himself. Go away from here."

'Urfadja Ibn 'Abd Allāh, another man of the tribe, said, "I swear by God, Ḥārith is right. Expel this man from this place. His master is not eligible to be the caliph and the Muhādjirūn and Anṣār are not better than the Prophet (s) in knowing the expediency of the government."

Ziyād went to Medina and said, "The people of Kinda have revolted and have become apostate."[1]

Ibn A'tham's further explanations on the disputes among the people of Kinda and Abū Bakr reveal their problem was Abū Bakr's caliphate. Making his mind to fight the Kinda tribes, Abū Bakr summoned 'Umar and said, "I want to send 'Alī Ibn Abī Ṭālib to fight them because, فانه عدل رضا عند اكثر الناس لفضله وشجاعته وقرابته وعلمه وفهمه ورفقه بما يحاول من الامور He is just and acceptable more to the public because of his excellence, valour, kinship and knowledge as well as his handling of affairs.

'Umar said, "You are right. 'Alī is as you say but I fear one thing. I fear he may refuse to fight them. If he does not go to war, no one else will do so unless with disgust."[2]

This discussion and 'Umar's consultation with Abū Ayyūb show that there were some people among them who opposed fighting Muslims.

The caliph considered these things instances of apostasy, and historians have recorded these fights as the battles of Radda. These wars may be justified as necessary tactics for safeguarding the government but it is hard to prove the tribes' apostasy. When Abū Bakr decided to fight these tribes, some of his men, including 'Umar, objected to his decision. Later on, 'Umar

---

[1]. al-Ridda,pp.173-179; al-Futūḥ,ol.I,pp.57-61

[2]. al-Futūḥ,vol.I,p.71-72

said he opposed Abū Bakr's decision in the beginning but after some time, he learnt that caliph was right.

The question is whether these tribes were apostate or fighting them was permissible or not? Abū Bakr believed in their apostasy, so he even took their women and children captive and brought them to Medina.[1] It seems that 'Umar, like many Muslims, agreed with fighting them in principle but did not believe in their apostasy. According to Shahristānī, it was because of this belief that 'Umar freed their captives[2] when he became the second caliph.

Another problem was that even if the tribes were apostate, many believed that it was illegitimate to take captives from apostates.[3]

There are numerous documents at hand indicating that some tribes were considered apostate because they refused to pay tax alms. For instance, a group of Yamāma people believed in the principle of paying tax alms but refused to pay tax alms to Abū Bakr.

They used to say, "We collect tax alms from the rich in our tribes and distribute it among the poor and needy among ourselves, but we will pay nothing to whom the Book and traditions have not recommended him."[4] Ya'qūbī, too, writes, "Some people only refused to pay tax alms to Abū Bakr."[5]

As mentioned earlier, 'Umar opposed the idea of apostasy of these tribes. According to Ibn A'tham, when Abū Bakr wanted to kill the captives of the battles of Radda,[6] 'Umar said, "These people believe in Islam and they swear about it. Imprison them for the time being to see what happens next."

Abū Bakr jailed them in the house of Ramla, daughter of Ḥārith. After Abū Bakr's death, 'Umar told them, "You know what my opinion was about you. Now, you are all free without any ransom. Go wherever you want."[7]

---

1. al-Muṣannaf, 'Abd al-Razzāq,vol.x, p.176; Abū Bakr once ordered his men to set atheists on fire and fall them down the mountain.

Al-Djaṣṣāṣ, Aḥkām al-qur'ān, vol.III, pp.67 and 81

2. al-Milal wa l-niḥal, vol.I, p.31; Djāmi' al-bayān al-'ilm, vol. II, p.129

3. Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, vol.III, p.151

4. al-Ifṣāḥ, p.121

5. Tārīkh al-ya'qūbī, vol.II, p.128

6. Maqdisī says, "Abū Bakr sent Khālid to sword-kill people of Ridda, set fire to them, hold their children and women captive and share their properties.

Al-Bad' wa l-tārīkh, vol.v, p.157

7. al-Futūḥ, vol.I, p.75; Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā, vol.VII, PP.101-102

Qays on behalf of 'Āṣim Minqarī was commissioned by the Prophet (s) to collect tax alms from his tribe. After the Prophet's demise, he collected the tax alms but instead of giving it to Abū Bakr, he distributed them among the poor in his tribe. This was considered as a criminal act. Even a proverb was made in this regard which said "More criminal than Qays be 'Āṣim."[1]

Ibn Kathīr, too, has reiterated that many Muslims refused to pay their tax alms to Abū Bakr.[2] Mawbakhtī writes a group said they would not pay tax alms until it was known who was holding the government; therefore, they distributed the tax alms among the poor.[3]

Maqdisī, too, says, "A group of them refused to pay tax alms while others opposed rejected the principle of tax alms."[4]

Besides not recognizing Abū Bakr's rule, another problem of the tribes was that after hearing the news of the Prophet's passing, they severed their relations with Medina. They only believed in having a religious connection with Medina, and when the Prophet of Islam passed away, they felt no need for accepting the rule of someone else. Therefore, as they refused to pay tax alms to Medina, they were labeled apostate.[5] These tribes believed there was no need to assign a single ruler for all Muslims and that if they obeyed Muḥammad, it was because he was a prophet. But, after his demise, there would be no need to obey others. They said,

أطعنا رسول الله ما كان بيننا فيا لعباد الله ما لأبي بكر

إذا مات بكر قام بكر مكانه وتلكم لعمر الله قاصمة الظهر[6]

---

[1]. al-durra al-fākhira, p.324; Madjma' al-amthāl, vol.II, p.65

[2]. al-Bidāya wa l-nihāya, vol.VI, p.311

[3]. Firaq al-shī'a, p.4

[4]. al-Bad' wa l-tārīkh, vol.V, p.151

[5]. Tārīkh al-'arab wa l-islām, p.71

Ḥasan Ibrāhīm Ḥasan says, "The atheists were those who refused to pay Zakāt, tax alms, thinking that the Messenger(s) blackmails them. It is to be noted that they never challenged and loathed Islam.....they agreed on monotheism, foundation of Islam but they thought they had to pay tax alms only to the Prophet(s)".

Tārīkh Siyāsī Islām, vol.I, p.216

'Aqqād also says, "A group of others believed in mere tax alms but they never took faith in those who had to pay tax alms."

'Abqariyya al-ṣiddīq, pp.124-125

[6].Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.II, p.246; Masā'il al-imāma, p.14; Kitāb al-ridda, pp.171-172; Mukhtaṣar Tārīkh Dimashq, vol.III, p.409; al-Aghānī, vol.II, p.157; al-Djamal, p.181; al-Shi'r wa l-shu'arā', p.65; al-Bad' wa l-tārīkh, vol.V, p.156; Taṭawwur al-fikr al-siyāsī 'Ind ahl al-Sunna, p.38, footnoteII,; Muqaddama fī tārīkh ṣadr al-islām, p.51

We obeyed the Messenger when he was alive but why shall we obey Abū Bakr?

When Abū Bakr died, a man like him came to power, that is – by God – backbreaking.

Thus, they did not deem it necessary to obey the rule of Medina and the rulers of Medina counted them among apostates.[1]

Muḥammad Ibn Idrīs Shāfi'ī writes, "This was because Arabs living in the outskirts of Mecca knew no rule and resented being ruled by others. The reason they accepted to obey the Messenger of God, was because they did not consider anyone else deserving obedience."[2]

This reasoning has been brought in the poetry of Mālik Ibn Nuwayra. Addressing his tribe, he said,

وقلت خذوا أموالكم غير خائف ولا ناظـــر فيما يجئ من الغد

فـــإن قام بالأمر المخوّف قائم منعنا وقلنا: الدين دين محمد[3]

"I told you to take your money (tax alms) with no fear and no worries of what happens tomorrow, If someone assumes power, we will tell him, the only religion is the religion of Muḥammad."

Abū Bakr's insistence on collecting tax alms from all tribes was to strengthen his government in Medina.

He said, "If they do not pay me the tax alms they used to pay to the Prophet (s) every year, I will fight them."[4]

There is no doubt that the majority of the Prophet's companions did not like Abū Bakr's idea of war[5] but they obeyed him because he was the ruler.

Maqdisī said the first dispute among Muslims was leadership while the second was fighting those who refused to pay tax alms. Muslims opposed Abū Bakr's view of tax alms collection but after a while, the majority of

---

[1]. Tārīkh al-'arab wa l-islām, p.71; Taṭawwur al-fikr al-siyāsī 'Ind ahl al-Sunna, p.38

Nāshi' Akbar says, "Some believed they were not atheist but they refused to pay poll tax, saying that the poor are superior to that, They would pay that to the agents of the Prophet(s) just for the sake of the Prophet and now that he has passed away, people would give it to any poor one they wished.

Masā'il al-imāma, p.14

[2]. al-Risāla, p.80

[3]. Ṭabaqat fuḥūl al-shu'arā', vol.I,p.206; Ṭabaqat fuḥūl al-shu'arā', 1400 H; word of religion in the subject poem means government as footnoted by the proofreader.

[4]. al-Imāma wa l-siyāsa, vol.I, p.35

[5]. Djāmi' al-bayān al-'ilm, vol.II, pp.104 and 125

them accepted his rule. The opposition remained and some Muslims believed fighting them was a mistake.[1]

We quoted 'Umar as saying that 'Alī (a) might avoid fighting the Kinda people. Elsewhere, we said Abū Bakr was ready to fight them himself, but Imām 'Alī (a) asked him to stay in Medina[2] and send another one to fight them. Obviously, a group of those the caliph fought against were real apostates.

Another quotation from Madā'inī says after Imām 'Alī (a) opposed Abū Bakr, 'Uthmān told Imām, "Nobody will join the Muslim army to fight the apostates if you do not swear allegiance to Abū Bakr." 'Uthmān's insistence made Imām 'Alī swear allegiance to Abū Bakr.[3] On the other hand, there were some people in Medina who wished for the success of apostates to once again maintain their infidel beliefs of the Dark Age. One day, a man of the Umayya and another man from the Anṣār were boasting for each other.

The former said, "When the Prophet of Islam passed away, the majority of his companions were from the the Umayya."

The Anṣārī man replied, "Yes." و لكنهم حالفوا أهل الردة على هدم الاسلام[4] "They allied with the atheists to destroy Islām."

'Āyisha, too, has said about wide-scale discord in Medina in the first days of his father's caliphate.[5] Also, Mecca was about to return to absolute apostasy after the Prophet's demise, but Suhayl Ibn 'Amr's remarks stabilized Mecca's situation.

Ibn Athīr writes, "After the Prophet's passing, Mecca was on the verge of apostasy and 'Attāb Ibn Asīd sought a hiding."

Suhayl Ibn 'Amr stood up and addressed the people of Mecca, لاتكونوا آخر من اسلم وأول من ارتد[6] "Do not be the last one to embrace Islam and the first one to become an apostate."

At any rate, we must not ignore the fact that Medina's resistance against apostasy helped the administration in the city to be stronger and bring other lands under its control after passing through this tortuous period. Khālīfa Ibn Khayyāṭ has listed the apostates as follows,

---

1. al-Bad' wa l-tārīkh, vol.V, p.123

2. al-Mi'yār wa l-muwāzana, p.94

3. Talkhīṣ al-shāfī, vol.III,p.77

4. Rabī' al-abrār, vol.I, pp.708-709

They allied with the atheists to destroy Islam.

5. Tārīkh khalīfat Ibn khayyāṭ, p.102; al-Muṣannaf, Ibn Abī Shayba, vol.VII, p.434

6. Usd al-ghāba, vol.II, pp.371-372

Ṭulayḥa Ibn Khuwaylad, Banū Sālim, Banū Tamīm, Banū Yamāma, Banū Baḥrayn, Banū Ummān, Banū Nadjīr, Ḥadramawt and Banū Yemen, Banū Radda.[1]

ABŪ BAKR'S AGENTS

It is known to all that 'Umar was Abū Bakr's closest companion and old friend. The Prophet of Islam had spelled their brotherhood union along with the Muhādjirūn.[2] Although Abū Bakr was a major architect of the issue of caliphate and showed he was better than 'Umar in his battles against apostates, accepted 'Umar's views in many cases due to 'Umar's seriousness and toughness. These two were complementary to each other. We wrote that during the Saqīfa developments, too, they were always together. It was due to this insistence that during the Saqīfa issue, Imām 'Alī (a) accused 'Umar of trying to secure his own future.[3]

Abū Bakr said about 'Umar, "He is the dearest of people to me."[4]

Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd says, "Abū Bakr could not gain caliphate if 'Umar had not helped him."[5]

It is said that Abū Bakr appointed 'Umar as a judge.[6] Also, he used to lead congregational prayers when Abū Bakr was absent.[7] It was in the 11th Ḥidjra year that Abū Bakr appointed him "emir of the pilgrims to Mecca".[8] Khālīfa Ibn Khayyāṭ, listing Abū Bakr's emirs, writes, وعلى أمره كله والقضاء عمر بن الخطاب[9] "Every affair including judiciary one of 'Umar Ibn Khaṭṭāb."

'Umar's influence on Abū Bakr was so immense that he dissuaded the caliph from appointing Khālid Ibn Sa'īd as the commander of the Muslim army dispatched to Damascus and instead, sent Yazīd Ibn Abī Sufyān. After returning to Medina and seeing Abū Bakr's choice, Khālid Ibn Sa'īd refused

---

1. Tārīkh khalīfat Ibn khayyāṭ, pp.102-117

2. Sahmī, Tārīkh Djurdjān, p.96

3. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.I, p.567; Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, vol.VI, p.11; al-Imāma wa l-siyāsa, vol.I, p.11; Anas Ibn Mālik says, "On Saqīfa, I saw 'Umar forcing Abū Bakr to go on pulpit. al-Muṣannaf, 'Abd al-Razzāq, vol.V, p.438

4. Nathr al-durr, vol.II, p.17; Gharīb al-ḥadīth, vol.III, p.222; al-adab al-mufrad, p.29

5. Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, vol.I, p.174

6. Tārīkh al-madīnat al-munawwara, vol.II, p.665; Ibn Djūzī, Manāqib 'Umar, p.48; al-Kāmil fi l-tārīkh, ol.II, p.420; al-Tanbīh wa l-ishrāf, p.249

7. Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā, vol.III, p.186; al-Kāmil fi l-tārīkh, vol.II, p.425

8. Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā, vol.III, p.187

9. Tārīkh khalīfat Ibn khayyāṭ, p.123

to swear allegiance to the caliph for some time.[1] 'Umar, himself, was aware of his power so he made use of his rank and divided the properties of Mu'ādh Ibn Djabal into two halves and took one half for Bayt al-Māl, the Treasury of Muslims.[2] He did the same thing later to the governors of cities when he assumed caliphate. Abū Bakr could not do anything in the absence of 'Umar, so when he wanted to send Usāma's army to Damascus, he asked Usāma, the commander of the army, to let 'Umar stay with the caliph and help him in the administration of affairs.[3] Also, once when Khālid had made a mistake and Abū Bakr would not agree to write a letter of protest to him, 'Umar wrote a letter himself, but Khālid paid to attention to it and said he knew 'Umar had done it.[4]

At any rate, 'Umar's influence and the strong link between the two, made Abū Bakr appoint him as his successor. In other words, basically, people did not consider their caliphate two separate things and from the very beginning, they saw one of them as successor to the other one.[5] For the same reason, when Abū Bakr was in coma and wanted to write an agreement about his successor, his scribe, 'Uthmān, wrote 'Umar's name in the agreement because he knew whom the caliph was thinking of.

Khālid Ibn Walīd was another functionary of Abū Bakr. He belonged to the tribe of Banū Makhzūm, a family of the Quraysh, who converted to Islam on Ṣafar 1st, 8th AH.[6] He was physically a powerful man but void of ethical values. He committed various faults when the Prophet (s) was alive. Some documents have said it was the Prophet (s) who named him "God's sword" but Ibn Durayd and others say Abū Bakr gave him the title.[7] He got the title when he killed Mālik Ibn Nuwayra unfairly and when people like 'Umar asked Abū Bakr to punish him. But the caliph said he was a sword hoisted by God and he would never bring it down.[8] According to Ibn A'tham, Khālid named himself "Sayf Allāh or God's sword" and Abū Bakr approved it.[9]

---

1. al-Muṣannaf, 'Abd al-Razzāq, vol.V, p.454; Ḥayāt al-ṣaḥāba, ol.II, p.20

2. Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā, vol.III, pp.585-588

3. Ibid. vol.I, pp.29-30; Ḥayat al-ḥayawān, vol.I, p.48

4. al-Futūḥ, vol.I, p.44; Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, ol.I, p.179

5. Maqdisī says, "People raised no doubt that 'Umar would become Abū Bakr's caliph al-Bad' wa l-tārikh, vol.V, p.167

6. Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā, vol.VII, p.394

7. al-Ishtiqāq, p.149; Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, vol.XVI, pp.158-159

8. al-Futūḥ, vol.I, p.23; al-Muṣannaf, 'Abd al-Razzāq, vol.V, p.212; al-Īḍāḥ, pp.72-73; Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, vol.I, p.179

9. al-Futūḥ, vol.I, p.149

It is said that Khālid was a supporter of Abū Bakr and an opponent of Imām 'Alī (a).[1] He also accompanied the group who invaded Imām 'Alī's house to force him into swearing allegiance with Abū Bakr.[2] He is also believed to be a person who prepared the ground for Abū Bakr's caliphate.[3]

The story of Mālik Ibn Nuwayra's murder, and the subsequent rape of his wife which Ibn A'tham said he did upon the consensus of people of knowledge, shows the weak moral character of Khālid. However, Abū Bakr insisted on keeping him the commander of his army and sending him to crack down on apostates and false prophets. Abū Bakr defended Khālid with the justification that Khālid had acted on Idjtihād so he did not deserve punishment. One day Khālid burnt some of the captives of apostates with fire. When 'Umar objected, Abū Bakr said he was God's sword.[4] 'Umar's objection was why he had appointed a commander who killed people and tortured them with fire.[5] Apparently, despite all his attention to 'Umar, the caliph was unwilling to stop backing Khālid, and still, it is interesting to know that when 'Umar, himself, took power as the second caliph, unlike his earlier emphasis on stoning Khālid for raping Mālik Ibn Nuwayra's wife, he sufficed to sacking him.[6] Khālid was sure his acts would meet no objection on the part of Abū Bakr and if he received a letter of punishment from the caliph, it was from 'Umar; otherwise, Abū Bakr trusted him.[7] Sometimes, he committed self-authorized acts because he was sure of Abū Bakr's support.[8]

Abū Bakr once said, "No mother can give birth to someone like Khālid."[9] Once when he killed two people who had letters of clemency from Abū Bakr, some people complained about it, but Abū Bakr defended Khālid as usual.[10] When 'Umar sat on the throne as the second caliphate, he

---

1. Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, vol.III, p.22

2. Ibid. vol.VI, p.48-49

3. Ibid. vol.XVIII, p.306-307

4. Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā, vol.VII, P.369

5. Futūḥ al-buldān, p.107

6. According to Tadhkirat al-khawāṣ(p.160), 'Umar separated Mālik from his wife after her pregnancy with Khālid and her delivery.

7. al-Futūḥ, vol.I, P.44

8. Ibn Ḥadjar quotes Zubayr Ibn Bakkār saying when Khālid took one fifth of booties, he never submitted any account to Abū Bakr. He always did things, including attempted murder of Mālik without informing Abū Bakr.

Al-Iṣāba, vol.I, p.414-415

9. al-Kāmil fī l-tārīkh, vol.II, p.389

10. Ibid. vol.II, p.398

immediately fired Khālid from the command of Damascus's army and replaced him with Abū 'Ubayda Djarrāḥ.

He said, "I sacked Khālid to show that God helps His religion."[1]

When Khālid was busy fighting in Iraq and received his letter of abdication to Damascus, he said, "'Umar's jealousy did not allow me to achieve the conquest of Iraq."[2]

According to Anas Ibn Mālik, 'Umar used to tell Abū Bakr, "Write to Khālid to ask for your permission before doing anything."

Abū Bakr wrote but Khālid responded, "You must leave me free in whatever I do; otherwise, I will resign."

'Umar said, "Dismiss him", but the caliph did not accept.[3] Khālid died in Medina or Damascus[4] in the 21st AH and accidentally, he appointed 'Umar as guardian of his will.

Ibn Sa'd quoted 'Umar as saying, "We had ill thoughts about Khālid, but we were wrong."[5]

'Umar opposed crying over the dead and said he had heard from the Prophet (s) that, إن الميت ليعذب ببكاء اهله "The dead person suffers when his family cries for him."

However, he allowed the women of Banū Makhzūm to cry for Khālid.[6] More surprising, 'Umar said at the time of his death, "If Khālid Ibn Walīd were alive, I would appoint him as my successor."[7]

Abū 'Ubayda Djarrāḥ was another pillar of power for Abū Bakr's caliphate. He, along with 'Umar and Abū Bakr, were the only men of the Quraysh who were present in Saqīfa Banū Sā'ida. He had an oath of brotherhood with Sālim Mawlā Ḥudhayfa [8] who was also influential in the issue of caliphate.

'Umar said about him, "If Sālim were alive, I would make him my successor."[9]

---

[1]. Tārīkh khalīfat Ibn khayyāṭ, p.122

[2]. Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā, vol.II, p.397

[3]. al-Iṣāba, vol.I, p.415

[4]. Ibid. Ibn Ḥadjar says they believe he has died in Damascus(Ḥimṣ)

[5]. Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā, vol.VII, p.397-398; al-Bidāya wa l-nihāya, vol.VII, p.115

[6]. al-Bidāya wa l-nihāya, vol.VII, p.116

[7]. Tārīkh al-madīnat al-munawwara, vol.II, p.887; al-Imāma wa l-siyāsa, vol.I, p.42

[8]. Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā, vol.III, p.410

[9]. Ibid. ol.III, p.343; al-Futūḥ, vol.II, p.86

It should be noted that 'Umar said the same thing about Abū 'Ubayda at the time of his death.[1] Abū 'Ubayda was first appointed in charge of the Treasury of Muslims but later, became the commander of the Damascus army[2] and served until his death in 18th Ḥidjra year when he died in Amawas plague.

The commanders and functionaries of Abū Bakr were Yazīd Ibn Abī Sufyān, 'Amr Ibn 'Āṣ, Shuraḥbīl Ibn Ḥasana(18 H)[3] and 'Akrama Ibn Abī Djahl. Among his appointees, there were some people serving since the Prophet's time. Mu'adh Ibn Djabal in Yemen, 'Attāb Ibn Asīd in Mecca and 'Alā' Ibn Ḥadramī in Baḥrayn were some of these people. According to some documents, Abū Bakr appointed Anas as the ruler of Baḥrayn. Perhaps, it was another part of Baḥrayn. Muhādjir Ibn Abī Umayya ruled in Ṣan'ā, Ziyād Ibn Lubayd in the coastal regions of Yemen, Ya'lā Ibn Umayya in Khawlān, 'Uthmān Ibn Abi l-'Āṣ in Ṭā'if, and Sulayṭ Ibn Qays ruled in Yamāma. Also, it is said that 'Uthmān was Abū Bakr's scribe.[4]

It is evident that the list does not include important figures of the Prophet's companions, especially from the Anṣār. Apparently, this can be suitable evidence on the caliphate's neglect of the Anṣār.

CONQUEST OF DAMASCUS

The greater Syria was a land bounded by the Mediterranean Sea, the Western banks of the Euphrates, the northern border of Ḥidjāz, the southern border of the ancient Eastern Rome and modern-day Turkey. Presently, this land includes the countries of Syria, Jordan, Lebanon and Palestine. The new border demarcation was made during the developments after World War I. The name of Syria has always existed since ancient times and Herodot(425 AD) has called this land Syria. Probably, the name Syria has been taken from the word "'Ashūrīyya" attributed to Assyrians, although some have rejected this idea.[5]

Before falling to Muslims, the region of greater Syria was a colony of the Eastern Roman Empire. Centuries before the advent of Islam, big tribes of Arabs migrated from Ḥidjāz - mostly from south- to this land. The most important tribes recorded in the early advent of Islam, were, Quḍā'a, Ṣāliḥ,

---

[1]. al-Futūḥ, vol.II, p.16; al-Imāma wa l-siyāsa, vol.I, p.42; Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā, vol.III, p.412 and 343; Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.IV, p.227

[2]. Tārīkh khalīfat Ibn khayyāṭ, p.123

[3]. al-Muṣannaf, vol.V, p.454; Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā, vol.II, p.394

[4]. Tārīkh khalīfat Ibn khayyāṭ, p.123

[5]. Tārīkh Sūriya and Lubnān and Filisṭīn, pp.62-63

Ghasāsina, Djudhām, Lakhm, Kalb, Tanūkh, and Bahrā'. These tribes were sparse and scattered in the developed land of ancient Syria and each settled in a city or village.

These tribes forgot their Arab rites and rituals due to the many years of life with the Romans and the majority of them converted to Christianity.

However, they had kept parts of their Arab nature. The first sign of their conversion to Christianity was mixing their Arab language with Syriac, and basically, Syriac had become their scientific language. Therefore, it was recommended later that Arabic should not be learnt from Qaḍā'a and Ghassān because they read books in Syriac and naturally, their language had become mixed.[1] Shaykhū insists in showing that all Arabs living in the greater Syria had converted to Christianity before the advent of Islam. We believe he is overstating this fact. Earlier, we negated his views on the Christianity of the tribes of Aws and Khazradj. At any rate – true of false – he has provided a list of Arab tribes who converted to Christianity.[2]

Years before the advent of Islam, the Arabs of this land were allies of Romans in their battle against Iranians and fought the Iranian army and its allied Arabs from Iraq. In those years, the Roman army consisted of Arabs and Romans.

Damascus Arabs held different views with Arabs living on Ḥidjāz and they had different social behavior as well. The Arabs of Damascus had left their Bedouin life because they lived in a developed area and had become city dwellers in Damascus, Ḥalab (Aleppo), Ḥimṣ, etc. Their commonalities with the Romans made some of them migrate to Rome after the advent of Islam.[3] Of course, Romans always feared that racial commonality would urge the Arab tribes of Damascus to accept Islam. A more serious problem was difference in religion between the Christians of Damascus and the church of Constantinople in a way that they were greatly persecuted by the Eastern Church.

The Christians of Damascus believed in the Ya'qūbī sect[4] and it was a heretical practice in view of the Eastern Church. They believed that

---

[1]. Suyūṭī, al-Muzhir, quoted from, al-Naṣrāniyya wa Ādābuhā, p.31

[2]. al-Naṣrāniyya wa Ādābuhā, pp.124-141

[3]. Futūḥ al-buldān, pp.128 and 137

[4]. Ya'qūbī's creed is ascribed to Ya'qūb Bardā'ī(b.578AD). his followers are called monophysicist. The said creed is about the Christ believing in one divine nature rather than two divine human natures. Ya'qūbī expanded the sect throughout Syria, so named after the sect. It spread through Syria in the north to Armenia and to Egypt in the south and that is why the Armenians and Egyptians still keep this belief. Parallel to this, in Mesopotamia, there emerged Nestorian sect adopting two natures in Messiah though

Damascus Christianity was excellent in innovation![1] The religious difference of Damascus's Arab Christians with the Eastern Roman Church, to many, was one of the reasons for the consecutive Islamic conquests in the greater Syria.[2]

In addition to the Arab residents of the greater Syria, numerous Nibṭiyān, too, who were descendants of the earlier tribes and rulers in the region, lived in that land. Also, many Jews who are said to be between 100 to 200 thousands lived in that land.[3]

We mentioned earlier that at the time of the advent of Islam, the greater Syria was under the domination of the Eastern Roman empire. However, since centuries ago, local rulers had the power in that land. The Nibṭiyān government ruled first, followed by the Tadmur government and finally, the government of Ghassānid who were from the tribe of Ghasāsina. These came from Yemen apparently after the destruction of the Ma'rab Dam. This tribe converted to Christianity in the 4th century AD. Djafna Ibn 'Amr, from the elders of the tribe, was the founder of the Ghassānī dynasty and there are ambiguous quotations that between 11 to 32 rulers of this dynasty ruled in Damascus. There is little we know about a limited number of these more recent rulers. Ḥārith Ibn Djabala was one of their renowned personalities who ruled between the years 529-569. He fought the Lakhmids –the Arab rivals of the Ghasāsina who ruled Iraq – and helped his tribe rise to fame. He won the title of "Philark" meaning chieftain and also Biṭrīq (Patrick) from the Roman emperor for his services. The Ya'qūbiyya sect spread in Damascus in his time. After Ḥārith, his son, Mundhir, replaced him and ruled until 581, when crisis engulfed Damascus.[4] Between the years 611 and 614, Iranians fiercely invaded these regions and captured Jerusalem. Later, (Hiraql) Heraclitus could regain Jerusalem from Iranians. The names of Ghassānī princes ruling some cities and their command of the battle between the Roman-Arab army and the army of Islam indicates that the Ghasasinah still had great influence in Damascus and Constantinople. Djabala Ibn 'Ayham Ghassānī, a commander of the Roman army at Yarmūk, was one of

---

finding them not unified. The founder is Nestorius and it emerged several decades before Ya'qūbī's creed.

Tārikh Sūriya and Lubnān and Filisṭīn, pp.412-413; Will Durant's Tārikh Tamaddun, vol.IV(Age of Faith, part I)pp.63-64

[1]. al-Naṣrāniyya wa Ādābuhā, p.38

[2]. concerning different views in this respect, al-Shām fī ṣadr al-islām, pp.63-64; Tārikh Tamaddun, vol.IV, P.64

[3]. al-Shām fī ṣadr al-islām, p.62

[4]. Tārikh Sūriya and Lubnān and Filisṭīn, pp.447-450

these influential princes who converted to Islam but became an apostate and went to the Roman emperor for certain reasons mentioned elsewhere.

Heraclitus was the son of Herakleios, whose father ruled in Christian Africa on behalf of the Roman Empire. The Eastern Empire Roman Empire experienced serious crises in the closing years of the sixth century AD and the early years of the 7th century.

The attacks of Āwārs and Islāws from the West caused problems for this vast land, but most pressing were the civil wars. A sergeant named Fūkās united people and revolted against the government of the aristocrats and killed Emperor Mavrikius and all his children. This civil unrest prompted Khusraw Parvīz to invade the greater Syria and capture Jerusalem in 614. He continued his assaults on Asia Minor. The aristocrats of Constantinople sought help from Heraclitos, the ruler of Africa. He sent his son, who was also named Heraclitos, to Rome. The son who was a brave man, succeeded in defeating Fūkās and put on the crown of emperor. The capture of Jerusalem was a good pretext for inciting Christians to fight Iranians. After restoring calm, Heraclitos set off to fight Iranians in the year 622 and after six years of sustaining consecutive defeats, he finally managed to pursue Iranians as far as the gate of Ctesiphon and made them accept peace.[1] These incidents took place in the 7th and 8th years of Ḥidjra.

When Heraclitos was busy reorganizing his affairs, Muslims made their first attacks on Damascus and captured the city after a while. The last days of the empire coincided with the conquest of Egypt in 640 AD.[2]

The greater Syria was the first priority for Muslims because they had managed to make the Quraysh sign the Ḥudaybiyya peace accord after years and get ready for spreading Islam outside Ḥidjāz.

The Prophet of Islam sent a few messengers to these regions. Ḥārith Ibn 'Umayr was one of these messengers who took a letter to the ruler of Baṣra. He was killed by Shuraḥbīl Ibn 'Amr of the Ghassāni dynasty. Then, the Prophet of Islam sent his 3,000-strong army under the command of Dja'far Ibn Abī Ṭālib, Zayd Ibn Ḥāritha and 'Abd Allāh Ibn-Rawāḥa to Muta in southern Damascus. The army prepared to fight Muslims in Damascus- according to Ibn Isḥāq - was a combination of the Roman army and the Arab tribes of Lakhm, Djudhām, Balqi, Buhra', and Bali.[3] Muslims were unsuccessful and after the martyrdom of their commanders and a number of others, they could only return to Medina. The Tabūk operations were the

---

[1]. The beginning Verses of Rūm Sūra referring to defeat of Romans and promising their imminent victory are concerned with the same events.

[2]. About life of Heraclitos and the events in his time, Tārikh Tamaddun, vol.IV(Age of Faith, part I)pp.543-545

[3]. Tārikh al-ṭabarī, vol.I, p.37

Prophet's next measure. This operation, likewise, entailed nothing for Muslims except several accords with some Arab tribes. The Prophet mobilized another army in the final days of his life under Usāma Ibn Zayd but it was sent to Damascus after his death and returned home empty-handed. All these army deployments show the importance of Damascus in view of the Prophet. Damascus was close to Medina and Muslims were quite familiar with its importance. It came out in the following years that Damascus was more important than Iraq to the succeeding caliphs.

With the end of the Radda operations, Abū Bakr wrote letters to the people of Mecca, Ṭā'if, Yemen and all Arabs in Ḥidjāz and Nadjd and summoned them for Djihād or holy war.

In his letters, he promised the booties in Rome. Numerous people rushed to Medina from tribes across Ḥidjāz.[1] A strong army of Muslims left for Damascus in the 12th AH (633 AD). Abū Bakr divided the army of Islam into three armies with three commanders. The first army commanded by 'Amr Ibn 'Āṣ, was to leave for 'Ayla in the Gulf of 'Uqba. The second army's commander was Yazīd Ibn Abī Sufyān and the third commander was Shuraḥbīl Ibn Ḥasana. These two commanders were sent to a region between Tabūk and Mu'ān. Khālid Ibn Sa'īd was supposed to command one of these armies, but due to his objection to Abū Bakr's caliphate, upon 'Umar's emphasis, they replaced him with Yazīd Ibn Abī Sufyān.[2] A short while later, Abū 'Ubayda Djarrāḥ joined them with his auxiliary men and he commanded all forces when they all operated in the same region. Some people believe he commanded an army from the beginning.

The first clashes of Muslims with Romans occurred in a region called "Wādī al-'Araba", south of the Dead Sea. Palestinian governor, Sergius, was the commander of the Roman army. He was killed in this war and his army was defeated. The Muslims advanced along the Mediterranean coasts[3] and each of the armies fought in a region and joined others wherever necessary.[4] In the beginning, the Muslim armies had 3000 men each, but Abū Bakr sent fresh forces and the number of Muslim fighters in each army rose to 7500.

Shortly after, the total number of the army of Islam increased to 24000 men.[5]

---

[1]. Futūḥ al-buldān,p.115

[2]. Ibid.p.116

[3]. Tārikh Sūriya and Lubnān and Filisṭīn, vol.II, p.6

[4]. Futūḥ al-buldān, p.123

[5]. Futūḥ al-buldān, p.116

After the 'Araba battle, the second encounter was made in a village of district of Ghazza called Dāthin. This battle which took place in the month of Muḥarram of the 13th year of Ḥidjra,[1] ended in Muslims' victory.

Balādhurī has written about the war of Dāthin first and then, about the 'Araba battle, but he has mentioned a narration saying the battle of Dāthin happened in the beginning. According to historians, the Muslim army did not face any obstacles which required them to use their weapons on their way from Ḥidjāz to Wādī 'Araba. These sweeping victories frightened Heraclitos and made him recruit forces. The news of the Roman army's recruitment reached Medina and the caliph ordered stopping the operations temporarily on the Iraqi border. He sent Khālid Ibn Walīd and his army to Damascus. The Muslims captured Baṣra and Ma'āb after Dāthin in Rabi' al-Awwal of the 13th Ḥidjra year. Then, they moved towards Damascus. Hearing the news of the enemy's concentration in Udjnādayn, Muslims moved towards that place first. This bloody battle ended in the victory of Muslims in the Djamādī al-Awwal or Djamādī al-Thānī of the 13th Ḥidjra year although many Muslims, too, were martyred.[2] It was after this defeat of the Romans that Heraclitos who was in Ḥimṣ, left for Antioch. While Muslims were on their way to Damascus, the enemy regrouped and encountered the army of Islam in Mardj al-Ṣafar. This war took place in the month of Muḥarram of the 14th Ḥidjra year and once again, Muslims defeated the enemy. After that, Damascus was totally besieged by the army of Islam.

It is said that while Abū 'Ubayda had managed to open his way into the city, the archbishop of the city signed a peace accord with Khālid Ibn Walīd on the other hand and Abū 'Ubayda, too, had to accept it despite Muslims' objection. The conquest of Damascus forced many residents of the city who were mostly Roman or Arabs affiliated to them, into leaving for Antioch and joining Heraclitos. After their departure, Muslims settled in their unsettled houses.[3] Damascus fell to Muslims in Radjab of 14th Ḥidjra year, but Abū Bakr had died in Djamādī al-Thānī of the 13th Ḥidjra year after two years and three months and a few days of caliphate.

CONQUEST OF IRAQ

Iraq is an ancient land with an ancient civilization, known to the world as the Mesopotamian civilization. It is located in the north of Ḥidjāz, East of the greater Syria and West of Iran (behind the Djibāl region). Centuries

---

[1]. Aṭlas tārīkh Islām, p.126

[2]. Futūḥ al-buldān, p.121

[3]. Futūḥ al-buldān, pp.128-129

before the advent of Islam, Arab tribes residing on Ḥidjāz immigrated northwards to Syria and Iraq to escape the ever-increasing population.[1]

Their massive immigration and their many young forces gave them dominance over the native people of the regions and gradually, created an Arab environment. The Nibṭiyān of Iraq and Syria were the descendants of the ancient settlers of this land.[2] Iraq is known as "Sawād" for its fertile lands. Sawād means abundant farming.[3] During the advent of Islam, the Arab settlers of Damascus were said to be from the tribes of Tanūkh, 'Ibādiyyīn and Aḥlāf (different allied tribes). The Euphrates river was the border between Arabs of Damascus and Iraq. The Iraqi Arabs were called "Fārs Arab" and Arabs of Damascus were called "Roman Arab".[4]

The immigrant Bedouin Arabs began to dwell in cities due to the vastness of fertile lands in Iraq and many of them converted to Christianity under the pressure imposed from the West. The 'Ibādiyyīn, the majority of whom lived in Ḥīra, were Christians at large.[5] They believed in Nestorian Christianity and they were, indeed, a cultural tribe taught reading and writing to Arabs of Ḥidjāz during the Dark Age.[6]

Ḥīra was the chief city of Iraq that time. It is said that the word "Ḥīra" had been taken from Ḥartā, Ḥīrtā and Ḥīrtū in Syriac, meaning military camp. According to Arab literature in the Dark Age, this city was highly important in Iraq and was the seat of Lakhmids kings. After the advent of Islam and the establishment of the city of Kūfa in the vicinity of Ḥīra, the city turned to ruin and its building materials were used for constructing Kūfa.[7] Ḥīra was one league (six kms) away from Kūfa and before Islam it was a center for interaction of various cultures such as the Persian Sassanids culture, the culture of Byzantium, Nestorian Christianity and local idolatry.[8] Remnants of this city still remain today.[9]

The pre-Islamic history of Iraq is part of the history of Iran from the political aspect. That is why two historians, i.e. Ṭabarī and Dīnwarī, have mixed the history of this period of Iraq with the story of developments in

---

[1]. There is a disagreement on departure time of these tribes. al-Mufaṣṣal fī tārīkh al-'arab qabl al-islām, vol.III, p.162

[2]. al-Mufaṣṣal, vol.III, pp.172-173

[3]. al-Ṭarīq 'Ilā al-Madā'in, p.132

[4]. al-Mufaṣṣal, vol.III, p.165

[5]. Ibid.vol.III, pp.169-171

[6]. Tārīkh Irān, Cambridge (persian translation), vol.III, p.712

[7]. al-Mufaṣṣal, vol.III, p.159

[8]. Tārīkh Irān, Cambridge (persian translation), vol.III, p.710

[9]. About that, Uṣūl Asmā' al-mudun wa l-mawāqi' al-'Arāqiyya, vol.I, pp.100-101

Iran. The reason for this is the meaning of 'Arab Fārs or Persian Arab, similar to the situation of Damascus whose history was mixed with the history of the Roman Empire. The Āl Lakhm dynasty, known also as Āl Naṣr, Āl Nu'mān[1] and Dawlat al- Manādhara, had a situation like that of the Ghassānīds or Āl Djafna. Accidentally, both had similar fates, i.e. losing power in the early years of Islam. Iran and Rome jointly imposed pressure on them. Information existing about the Āl Lakhm dynasty is ambiguous in history books and Djawād 'Alī has tried to organize these pieces of information.[2] The first Lakhmī ruler was Djudhayma al-Abrash also known as Shāh Tanūkh in some inscriptions.

Other famous kings of this dynasty were Imra' al-Qays (d. 328 AD) overstated as the "king of all Arab world".[3] Lakhmī kings were mostly idolaters but due to being influenced by the Zoroastrian culture from the East and the Christian culture from the West, every now and then, they tended towards either direction. What is certain is that Nu'mān III of this dynasty who reigned until 602, was a Christian. We wrote that Nestorian Christianity was predominant in Iraq and Western Iran. The Sassanids kings supported this sect because the government of Byzantium was fighting it and it was politically in favor of Iran to defend this sect of Christianity.[4]

During this period, the political fate of Iran and Iraq were intertwined because the Iraqi government had practically been installed by Iran and it could not resist the Āl Ghassān or powerful Arab rivals from northern Saudi Arabia (like Kinda who claimed to rule the entire region and managed to wrest control of Ḥīra from Lakhm for three years.[5]) Iran, on the other hand, had to defend Iraq against its enemies because Iraq was a barrier on the way of the invasion of Bedouin Arabs and the Byzantium government and its puppet government in Damascus. This necessity made the Iranian government deploy soldiers to Ḥīra and its surrounding regions to guard Iranian borders there. Iran had contacts with Arabs not only in Iraq but it was also their neighbor on the eastern Saudi borders in the southern shores of the Persian Gulf. Some historians have reported of Iran's influence in Yathrib[6] one or two centuries before the advent of Islam. Sometimes, Iran had to give control of a region like Ubulla to a powerful tribe such as Banū Shaybān to defend the invasion of Bakr Ibn Wā'il.

---

[1]. it seems the reason is that there are several people named "Nu'mān" among kings of this dynasty as well as several people named " Mundhir ".

[2]. al-Mufaṣṣal, vol.III, from p.177 on

[3]. Tārīkh Irān, Cambridge (persian translation), vol.III, p.712

[4]. al-Naṣrāniyya wa Ādābuhā bayn 'Arab al-djāhiliyya, p.87

[5]. Tārīkh Irān, Cambridge (persian translation), vol.III, p.715

[6]. Tārīkh Irān.vol.III, p.713-714

Due to its many interests in Saudi Arabia, Iran once accepted to interfere in Yemen, the southernmost point of Ḥidjāz. In the early sixth century AD, Jews gained some power in Yemen and persecuted Christians. This made the Negus of Abyssinia, Yustī Niyānūs, invade Yemen in the year 525 AD. He suppressed the Jews and established a Christian rule there. Abraha, the commander of the operations and his son, Masrūq, ruled for fifty years in Abyssinia until Sayf Ibn Dhī Yazan put an end to their rule over Yemen with an 8000-soldier Iranian army. Many of the Iranian remained in Yemen[1] and formed the Abnā' or Persian generation of Yemen. Their number grew to the extent that they joined the army of Islam in the conquest of Egypt. They had a district and a mosque in the name of Persians in Fasṭāṭ that still existed until the third century.[2] When the Messenger of Allāh invited the heads of states to convert to Islam, famed Bāzān ruled Yemen. He had been installed by the Sassanids in Iran.

At any rate, Iran had important interests in Arab lands, especially in Iraq located on the border between Iran and Rome. Iran's interference in these regions was to the degree that in the year 602, Khusraw Parvīz ordered Nu'mān III, the last king of the Lakhmī dynasty, to step down step down. After him, the Iranian government replaced him with a local Christian named Iyās Ibn Qubayṣa to rule Ḥīra and with him, an Iranian border guard was appointed.[3] During a period of 30 years between the resignation of Āl Lakhm and the first attacks of Muslims on Ḥīra, drastic upheavals occurred in the relations of Iran and Byzantium, that required Iran's more direct interference in Iraqi affairs. In the years 611 to 614, Khusraw Parvīz launched a lengthy attack against Byzantium and captured a major part of the greater Syria including Quds. For many years, this created problems for the Byzantium government. This defeat is referred to in Qur'ān as the "Conquest of Rome". After a few years, Heraclitos succeeded in reinforcing his army and during six consecutive years of war, defeated the Iranian government until the year 628, when Khusraw Parvīz was killed and Iran had to accept peace. It is clear that Iran's defeat opened the way for the invasion of Iraq by the Byzantium government and the most important of all, by the Bedouin rebels. In the early years of the fourth decade of the seventh century AD, some chieftains of Arab tribes pleaded to the first caliph of Muslims to retake Iraq from Iran. They organized the first attack against Iran in 633 AD or 12th AH.

Muslim Arabs lived in the Western part of Ḥidjāz, but they had some links with the east of the peninsula as well. Especially, they exchanged visits

---

[1]. Tārīkh Irān, vol.III, p.720

[2]. Futūḥ miṣr wa akhbāruhā, p.129

[3]. Tārīkh Irān, Cambridge (persian translation), vol. III, p.720

with Nadjd and the tribes residing in it. Some time before the Prophet's demise, a large number of these tribes converted to Islam though it was not serious; therefore, after the Prophet's passing, apostasy spread in the eastern parts of Ḥidjāz, particularly in the land of Nadjd. The new government had no option but to quell them; otherwise, the same tribes would soon move toward Medina, too. So, Muslims were dispatched to those regionsto support the riots. The attack was partly commanded by Khālid Ibn Walīd. As he gradually advanced to supress these tribes, he came to the southern parts of Iraq. Some of the apostates had fled to Iraq and some of them, like Banū Tamīm, lived in that region. The consecutive victories of the Muslim army in those regions made the tribal chieftains of southern Iraq think of using these forces to capture Ḥīra. This was the first attempt for conquests in Iraq and then, in Iran.

One of the influential tribes in southern Iraq was Banū Shaybān, a branch of Bakr Ibn Wā'il tribe., Wā'il itself, was a branch of Rabi'a tribe. The region where Bakr Ibn Wā'il resided, started from Iraq and extended as far as Baḥrayn in the Persian Gulf.[1] Banū Shaybān was a rival of Āl Lakhm and one of those tribes whom Iranian had to give concessions to in the lands under their rule. One of the last Arabian-Iranian battles was Dhī Qār, in which Banū Shaybān fought against Iranians and are said to have defeated them. One of this tribe's leaders was Muthannā Ibn Ḥāritha who must be considered the main instigator of Muslims in the conquest of Iraq and then, Iran.

According to Dīnwarī, ever since Pūrān sat on the throne in Iran, rumors spread that there was nothing left of the Iranian glorious kingdom. Hearing about this, two people from Bakr Ibn Wā'il, Muthannā Ibn Ḥāritha and Suwayd Ibn Quṭba 'Idjalī, attacked the land of Iranians with their men (the first attacked Ḥīra and the second one invaded Ubulla). They would raid farmers and plunder them. After that, Muthannā wrote a letter to Abū Bakr and noted Iran's weakness.[2]

Abū Bakr who had heard about his assaults on the Iranians, said, "Who is this man, whose "news" reaches us before his "name"?" He was told the man was not an unknown person. After ending the war against apostates, Muthannā came to Medina and asked Abū Bakr's permission to fight the Iranians. Abū Bakr wrote an agreement for him. A few months later, he dispatched his brother to Medina to ask Abū Bakr to send forces to him and the caliph sent Khālid Ibn Walīd to Iraq.[3] According to Balādhurī, after getting the permission for war from Medina, Muthannā returned to his tribe

---

[1]. al-Ṭarīq 'Ilā al-Madā'in, p.202

[2]. Akhbār al-ṭiwāl, p.111

[3]. al-Iṣāba, vol.III, p.361

in Khiffān and invited them to convert to Islam and they all accepted. Then, Abū Bakr sent Khālid to Iraq and asked Muthannā to obey him.[1] Muthannā did his best to expand Islam in Iraq for some years until his death. It has been said that he and his tribe had come to the Prophet (s) and therefore, was considered one of the companions.[2] The Muslim army in these attacks is said to have been numbered at around 18000.[3]

It should be noted here that the Iranians' war in the conquest of Iraq was not against Arabs. What has been reported about he conquests indicates that the Iranian armies were the main side of these clashes, although it has been said that some men from Ḥidjāz and Arab Christians. In the conquest of Ubulla, the commander of the enemy's army was a man named Hurmuz whose part of army was commanded by Qubād and the other part, by Anūshdjān.[4] In fact, after the collapse of the Lakhmids, Iranians guarded this land and it was natural that in the Arabic environment of Iraq, Lakhmids could do this better than the Iranians. Therefore, it has been said that due to the fall of the Lakhmids, the southern wing of the Sassanids government was left almost without any support.[5]

We must also add that there are different versions about these conquests. One of the best-known narrators was Sayf Ibn 'Umar who was notorious for lying and fabricating stories. He tried to portray Khālid as an unnatural human being who even sometimes, did some supernatural tasks! Stories of the conquest of Iraq in the Tārīkh Ṭabarī, have been taken from his reports.

It is said that Khālid first captured Ubulla, although Wāqidī rejects it.[6] Another source says this city was captured by 'Utba Ibn Ghazwān. Also, we read that the city of 'Ullays was conquered based on a peace accord and then, Muslims moved toward Ḥīra from there. There are contradictory views on whether Ḥīra resisted Arab Muslims or not.[7] The nobles of Ḥīra have said that Ayās Ibn Qubayṣa was among them and they gave up the city peacefully provided that they would not destroy churches and palaces. Ḥīra's tributes were the first sent to Medina.[8] Ḥīra fell in Dhī Qa'da, 12th AH.

---

[1]. Futūḥ al-buldān, p.242

[2]. al-Istī'āb (on the margin of al-Iṣāba) vol.III, p.522; al-Iṣāba, vol.III, p.362

[3]. al-Ṭarīq 'Ilā al-Madā'in, pp.209-211

[4]. Ibid. pp.215-216

[5]. Spuler, Tārīkh Irān, vol.I, p.6

[6]. Mu'djam al-buldān, vol.I, p.431

[7]. Spuler, Tārīkh Irān, vol.I, p.8

[8]. Futūḥ al-buldān, p.244

Anbār was another major city of Iraq that fell to Muslims. It had been named Anbār (storehouse) because in the past, it used to be a place for Iranians to store their cereals. In fact, many Iranian forces and border patrols served in this region, and the city was naturally, a warehouse for their food. The city was famous until the second AH century and the establishment of Baghdād. It should be noted that before the conquest of the city by Muslims, Romans had burnt the city.[1] This indicates that a year before Iraq's conquest, Romans had done serious damage to the region. 'Ayn al-Tamr, in addition to Ubulla and Khurayba, were the places used for the stationing of Iranian border guards. They were either captured by force or peace. One of the captives of this city was Yasār, the ancestor of Muḥammad Ibn Isḥāq, the author of "Sīra Nabawī."[2]

The consecutive victories of Muslims which all came within at most a year on the one hand and lack of any serious resistance and fight on the part of Iranians against Muslim Arabs, show how disorganized the state of Iranian forces was in the region. Perhaps, some may say that Iranians did not take these attacks seriously and this may be true to some extent. But Iranians were aware of the changes in Ḥidjāz and the battles against apostasy, because they had too much influence on Baḥrayn and Yamāma and it is illogical to accept that they were unaware of these incidents and of the state of Muslims. Secondly, Iranians could not do anything even after taking Arabs' assaults seriously. Therefore, the Iranian army was not in a good shape at that time. This army suffered from the disorders that had beset the Iranian ruling system after its defeat from the Romans. It had seriously damaged the credibility of the Sassanids government among Iranians, themselves.

Spuler writes on the speedy withdrawal of the Iranian army from Iraq, "The speedy victories of Arabs and fast retreat of Iranian forces from the region had more deep-rooted reasons. On the one hand, Mesopotamia, with its Aramaic or Aramaic–turned settlers which was largely populated by Christians and besides them, followers of Baptism and Jews and limited number of Manicheans, opposed the rule of Iran in the region. On the other hand, there were few Iranians in the region and villagers showed no resistance against the advance of Arabs, although they did not welcome the invading Arabs as it was done simultaneously in Egypt extremely excited by the acts of Byzantium. However, the situation in Mesopotamia was similar to that of Egypt."[3]

---

[1]. Uṣūl Asmā' al-mudun wa l-mawāqi' al-'Arāqiyya, vol.I, p.31

[2]. Futūḥ al-buldān, p.248

[3]. Spuler, Tārikh Irān, vol.I, p.13

CHAPTER II
'UMAR'S CALIPHATE

ABOUT CALIPH II

'Umar was from the Banū 'Adī tribe, one of the branches of the Quraysh. His mother, Ḥantama, was the daughter of Hāshim Ibn Mughīra from the Banū Makhzūm clan. Banū Makhzūm was another branch of the Quraysh and an ally of the Umayya in the Dark Age. Unlike Abū Bakr, 'Umar converted to Islam years after the ordainment of Prophet Muḥammad (s). Many sources say he converted in the sixth Ḥidjra year. Mas'ūdī says he converted four years before Ḥidjra, i.e. the 9th Ḥidjra year.[1] 'Umar was present in wars and events in Medina, although history has recorded no specific memory about him. When his daughter, Ḥafṣa, became the Prophet's wife, his relations with the Messenger of God were reinforced. In this connection, he was like Abū Bakr. We wrote that the Prophet (s) made them brothers by contract.[2] They were inseparable throughout the entire life of the Prophet (s). They held common stances in the developments of Saqīfa and it was because of 'Umar's insistence on stabilizing Abū Bakr's caliphate that Imām 'Alī (a) accused him of working for his own future.[3] This was well justified for others.

When Abū Bakr handed over the oath of caliphate to him and asked him to read it for the people, someone asked him, "What is in this letter?"

He replied, "I do not know for sure, but I shall be the first one to obey it!" The person said, "But I know what it is." أمّرته عام أوّل وأمّرك العام "The first year you appointed him caliph and the second year, he installed you as the caliph of Muslims."[4]

---

[1]. Murūdj al-dhahab, vol.II, p.321

[2]. Sahmī, Tārīkh Djurdjān, p.96

[3]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.I, p.587; Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, vol.VI, p.11; Anas Ibn Mālik says, "On Saqīfa, I saw 'Umar forcing Abū Bakr to sit on the pulpit.

al-Muṣannaf, 'Abd al-Razzāq, vol.V, p.438

[4]. Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, vol.I, p.174. Once Abū Bakr transferred a piece of land to someone with a title deed registered under his name, but 'Umar took the deed and destroyed it.

The above quotation shows that people were aware of the political bond between these two. Apparently, people saw one way of thinking throughout the caliphate of Abū Bakr in these two persons. In other words, they believed that 'Umar's caliphate was the continuation of Abū Bakr's and that their caliphate was a single administration.

Qays Ibn Abī Ḥāzim says, "I saw 'Umar in the mosque, with a stick of date branch in his hand trying to make people sit down. Abū Bakr's servant, named Shudayd, came to the mosque and read a message from Abū Bakr and then, 'Umar mounted the pulpit."[1] "It is true to say that Abū Bakr would not be a caliph if it were not for 'Umar.[2] When Abū Bakr wanted to appoint Khālid Ibn Sa'īd as commander of the army, 'Umar managed to change his mind because Khālid swore allegiance to Abū Bakr only three months after the Saqīfa gathering.[3] Abū Bakr used to say he loved 'Umar more than others."[4]

'Umar addressed Ibn 'Abbās and said, "Indeed, if Abū Bakr did not believe me, he would set aside your share of the government, and in that case, your tribesmen (Quraysh) would hate you."[5] It was this belief in 'Umar that made Abū Bakr write an accord appointing 'Umar as his successor. Once he said, "I appointed 'Umar to succeed me because I was afraid of eruption of any tension."[6]

Before the appointment of 'Umar, Abū Bakr consulted 'Abd al-Raḥmān Ibn 'Awf. He praised the caliph and said 'Umar was a quick-tempered man. Abū Bakr said, "He shows to be so in contrast with my tender-heartedness. He will calm down when he takes power." Abū Bakr consulted 'Uthmān, too.

Ḥayāt al-ṣaḥāba, vol.II, p.47. Interesting to know is that they call them " 'Umarayn" meaning two 'Umars.

[1]. Abū Bakr Khallāl, al-Sunna, p.277

[2]. al-Imāma wa l-siyāsa, vol.I, p.38 Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd writes, هو (عمر) الذي شيد بيعة ابي بكر ورقم المخالفين فيها وكسر سيف زبير.... ودفع صدر مقداد.... ولولاه لم يثبت لأبي بكر أمره ولا قامت له قائمته 'Umar was someone who straightened Abū Bakr's allegiance and removed the dissenters, spit apart Zubayr's sword, beat chest of Miqdād, if he had not helped, Abū Bakr's caliphate would never be organized; Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, vol.I, p.174

[3]. al-Muṣannaf, 'Abd al-Razzāq, vol.V, P.254

[4]. Gharīb al-ḥadīth, vol.II, p.222; Nathr al-durr, vol.II, p.17; al-Fā'iq fī Gharīb al-ḥadīth, vol.III, p.333; al-Adab al-mufrad, Bukhārī, p.29

[5]. Nathr al-durr, vol.II, p.28

[6]. Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā, vol.III, p.200

He said, "'Umar's nature is better than his countenance."[1] This is all the consultation Abū Bakr made with the nobles of the Quraysh before appointing 'Umar.

'Uthmān was always present in the caliph's bedside during his sickness. Abū Bakr asked him to write the contract of succession on his behalf. After the beginning of the contract was written, Abū Bakr fell into coma and 'Uthmān who knew his assignment, finished the oath and wrote the name of 'Umar in it. After regaining consciousness, Abū Bakr asked 'Uthmān to read what he had written. He did so and Abū Bakr approved it.[2] Following this, Ṭalḥa came to Abū Bakr and said, "You witnessed how 'Umar behaves beside you and with your presence. Then, we do not know what he will do without you." Abū Bakr was angered by his objection.[3] Another quotation says the people objected to Abū Bakr for appointing a bad-tempered man to rule them.[4] According to Ibn 'Abd al-Barr, Abū Bakr asked Mu'ayqab al-Rūsī about the people's opinion regarding the appointment of 'Umar and he replied, "Some are satisfied, some are not."

Abū Bakr said, "Which group is greater in number?"

He said, "Those who are dissatisfied."

Abū Bakr said, "The truth always shows its ugly face first, but it is finally the winner."[5] 'Umar, himself, in his first sermon said he was aware of the fact that some people hated his caliphate.[6] Ibn Qutayba has said that after hearing the news of Abū Bakr's death, Muslims in Damascus expressed their concern over 'Umar's likely coming to power and said, "If

---

[1]. Tārikh al-ṭabarī, vol.III, P.428; Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā, vol.III, p.199

[2]. Tārikh al-ṭabarī, vol.III, p.429; Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, vol.I, pp.163-165; Nathr al-durr, ol.II, pp.15 and 23; al-Kāmil fi l-tārikh, vol.II, p.425; Ḥayāt al-ṣaḥāba, vol.II, p.26; Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā, vol.III, p.200

[3]. Tārikh al-ṭabarī, vol.III, p.433

'Āyisha mentions objection of "so and so", Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā, vol.III, p.274. Abū Bakr was told, "When he was not "caliph", he harshly treated us." "Oh, if he becomes a ruler, what will he do to us?"

al-Muṣannaf, 'Abd al-Razzāq, vol.V, p.449. Others complained of his "tongue and stick".

al-Imāma wa l-siyāsa, vol.I, p.38. 'Alī also objected to Abū Bakr, Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā, vol.III, p.274; Ḥayāt al-ṣaḥāba, vol.II, p.26

[4]. Abū Bakr Khallāl, al-Sunna, p.275

[5]. Bahdjat al-madjālis, vol.I, p.579 and about other objections, Ma'rifat al-ṣaḥāba, vol.I, p.183; al-Futūḥ, vol.I, p.152; al-Fā'iq fi Gharīb al-ḥadīth, vol.I, pp.99-100

[6]. Nathr al-durr, vol.II, p.61. He, in the same speech, asked God to make him "good-tempered". Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā, vol.III, p.274

'Umar assumes power, he will not be our "master" and we will topple him."[1] Abū Bakr did not make any serious consultations about 'Umar's caliphate.[2] He believed that many of the Muhādjirūn were thinking about occupying the seat of caliphate. Once he told 'Abd al-Raḥmān Ibn 'Awf that many men of Muhādjirūn were yearning for the seat of caliphate since the start of his caliphate.[3] In his deathbed, Abū Bakr warned 'Umar about the Muhādjirūn and their greed for ruling.[4]

Abū Bakr's act of setting an age for caliphate, the principle of "succession" became legitimate in the political jurisprudence of the Sunnites sect. However, according to Sunnites sources, this had no background in the Prophet's biography. The succession rule shares two pillars of hereditary government. In a hereditary government, the first pillar is succession and the second pillar is family and hereditary advantages. Its first pillar in the caliphate's biography took on a legitimate form. Just as Muḥammad Rashīd Riḍā has noted, this brought about hereditary caliphate in the time of the Umayya.[5]

Abū Bakr's written oath practically appointed 'Umar as the caliph. Therefore, the people's allegiance could not be influential in his reign. Finally, we should say that the people's disagreement did not mean he could not be a caliph. This was indeed a sort of swearing obedience and loyalty to caliph. 'Umar, himself, believed that Abū Bakr's selection as the caliph of Muslims was impromptu and that the government had to be undertaken at the consultation of the believers, but he sat on the seat of caliphate based on an oath. He criticized the way of selecting Abū Bakr but did not say anything about his odd way of assuming power.

---

[1]. al-Imāma wa l-siyāsa, vol.I, p.38

[2]. Khayr al-Dīn Sawī writes, "Abū Bakr consulted with the companions before selecting 'Umar(Taṭawwur al-fikr al-siyāsī, p.40). Such a viewpoint clashes with historical facts and consultation with Ibn 'Awf and 'Uthmān is only knowm to us. Of course, disagreements are more informative to us. Fārūq Nabhān, too, claimed that Abū Bakr always received advice from the faithful people (Niẓām al-ḥukm fi l-islām, p.93)

[3]. Nathr al-durr, vol.II, p.16

[4]. Ibid.vol.II, P.22

[5]. al-khilāfa wa l-Imāma, al-'Uẓmā quoted from, Andīshih siyāsī dar Islām mu'āṣir, p.150; before Rashīd Riḍā, Marwān Ibn Ḥakam referred to Abū Bakr's measure of making caliphate hereditary!

THE CALIPH'S CHARACTER

The caliph was a quick-tempered man[1] and an extremist[2] and both characteristics seriously affected his political and administrative career. Management to him was some kind of strictness by which he did his best to control the Bedouin Arabs. His inner being was easily detectable in his thoughts and deeds during the lifetime of the Prophet of Islam. We know that in the war of Badr, he asked the Prophet (s) to kill all captives. His harsh treatment with Suhayl Ibn 'Amr, in the case of the Ḥudaybiyya peace deal, has been recorded in history. He also held extreme stances against the Ḥudaybiyya peace accord. On his first day of caliphate, he said, "O God! I am hot-tempered. Soften my behavior!"[3]

He knew he could not live without his lash. Therefore, he was the first one in Islam who took the lash of "Dirra" in his hand.[4] They have said his cane was more horrendous than the sword of Ḥadjdjādj.[5]

As said, Ṭalḥa objected to Abū Bakr as to why he imposed 'Umar upon them knowing that he is hot-tempered.[6]

According to Ibn Shubba, a man told 'Umar, "People are mad at you; they hate you."

'Umar asked, " why."

He replied, "They complain of your tongue and cane!"[7] One day, Zubayr's slave was standing in prayers after evening prayers when he saw

---

[1]. Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd writes, وكان في اخلاق عمر والفاظه جفاء وعنجهية ظاهرة 'Umar's ethics and words represented self-pride of some kind Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, vol.I, p.183

[2]. The caliph, in appearance, was tall and had a brown-colored face and on front part of head, he was hairless, "Aṣla'". According to Muḥammad Ibn Ḥabīb, he had deceitful eyes.al-Muḥabbar p.303; al-Munammaq, p.405

[3]. Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā, vol.III, p.274; Abū Bakr Khallāl, al-Sunna اللهم إني غليظ فليّنني O God! I am hot-tempered, make me soft-tempered.

[4]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.IV, P.209; Tārīkh al-khulafā', p.137; Ḥayat al-ḥayawān, vol.I, p.346; Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā, vol.III, p.282. The first one to be lashed by Dirrah was Umm Farwa, Abū Bakr's sister when she was crying for Abū Bakr after his death and 'Umar deemed crying for the dead unrightful.

Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, vol.I, p.181

[5]. Rabī' al-abrār, vol.III, p.188; Ḥayat al-ḥayawān, vol.I, p.51; Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, vol.I, p.188; al-Tarātīb al-idāriyya, vol.II, p.376; Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā, vol.III, p.281

[6]. Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, vol.VI, p.343, vol.I, p.164; Ḥayāt al-ṣaḥāba, vol.II, pp.128 and 130

[7]. Tārīkh al-madīnat al-munawwara, vol.II, p.858

'Umar approaching him with his Dirra (cane). The slave fled right then but 'Umar caught him. The slave said, "I'll never do so again!"[1]

After the death of Yazīd Ibn Abī Sufyān, 'Umar proposed marrying his wife but she did not accept because she believed 'Umar was bad-tempered when both leaving and entering the house.[2] Even 'Āyisha who had close relations with the caliph, prevented his marriage with her sister for the same reason.[3] 'Abd al-Razzāq Ṣan'ānī quoted Ibrāhīm Nakha'ī as saying that some day 'Umar was passing near a group of women when he smelled a perfume.

He said, "If only I knew whose perfume this is. Then, I would know what to do with her. Women should wear perfume for their husbands only." According to the same story, the woman who had worn perfume urinated out of fear[4] and another woman who saw her had a miscarriage.[5]

As a matter of fact, no one dared ask a question from 'Umar and he preferred to do it through 'Uthmān or someone else.[6]

'Umar considered the criterion of strictness in selecting his rulers for the states.[7] He did not show mercy to offenders, no matter what tribe they belonged to. This made Djabala Ibn 'Ayham, a ruler of Damascus, who had committed a fault flee from Mecca to Damascus and turn away from Islam.[8] Even governors and the caliph's children were not immune to his wrath. One day, he beat up one of his sons for the exquisite garment he had put on and the son burst into tears. When Ḥafṣa objected, 'Umar said, "He was acting proudly and I punished him to belittle him."[9] He beat one of his children to death for drinking wine.[10] Apparently, 'Amr Ibn 'Āṣ had lashed him in Egypt for the same reason and on his return to Medina, his father beat him to death. When he was about to die, he told his father, "You killed me!"

---

[1]. al-Ma'rifa wa l-tārikh, vol.I, pp.364-365

[2]. Nathr al-durr, vol.I, p.61 يدخل عابساً ويخرج عابساً He entered with sullen face and went out in the same way.

[3]. al-Aghānī, vol.XVI, p.93; al-Istī'āb, vol.I, p.273

[4]. al-Muṣannaf, 'Abd al-Razzāq, vol.IV,pp.343-344

[5]. Djāmi' al-bayān al-'ilm, vol.II, p.103; Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, vol.I, p.174

[6]. al-Fakhrī., p.106(Persian Translation)

[7]. al-'Iqd al-farīd, vol.I, p.15

[8]. Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā, vol.I,p.265; al-Futūḥ, vol.II, pp.302-304; Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, vol.I, p.183. About him, different stories are said of 'Umar's treatment and his repentance in manner of treating him. Tārikh al-ya'qūbī, vol.II, p.147

[9]. al-Muṣannaf, vol.I, p.416

[10]. Ḥayat al-ḥayawān, vol.I, p.49; Muṣ'ab Zubayrī, Nasab Quraysh, p.356

'Umar said, "If you should see God, tell Him we observe his punishment (Ḥadd) on earth."[1] His severe treatment raised public hatred and dissatisfaction. The people asked 'Abd al-Raḥmān Ibn 'Awf to talk to him in this regard and tell him that girls fear him even in their houses.

'Umar replied, "People will not be reformed except with this method; otherwise, they will even strip me of my clothes."[2] He, himself, admitted that people feared him because of his harshness.[3] In essence, the same treatments could stop public disagreement on his approach.[4] When the Prophet (s) ordered men not to beat their wives, 'Umar asked the Prophet (s) to let men beat their wives like in the past but he did not accept.[5]

We said that 'Umar's concept of religion had made an extremist out of him. Punishing his son to death for drinking wine was one example. He was very strict towards women and did not let them attend morning and evening congregational prayers. He did not have sensible military courage but he attached special significance to Djihād.[6] This is why he omitted "Ḥayya 'Alā Khayr al-'Amal" (Rush to the best deed) from Adhān (the call to prayers, under the pretext that people would not go to the holy war. Of course, he added a good part to Adhān and that was saying, "Prayer is better than sleep". Imām Sadjdjād and 'Abd Allāh Ibn 'Umar considered "Ḥayya 'Alā Khayr al-'Amal" (hasten to good deed) obligatory in Adhān[7] and Abū Ḥanīfa believed that "al-Ṣalāt Khayr min al-Nawm" (Prayer is better than sleep) should be told after Adhān because it is not part of it.[8]

At any rate, 'Umar was harsh in his contacts with people. This was contrary to the fact that he tried to rule as a caliph, not as a Sultan. It is good to retell a part of 'Utba Ibn Ghazwān's speech who served as ruler of Baṣra for six months only, and who was indeed commander of Muslim forces in Baṣra. Pointing to the economic problems in the time of the Prophet of Islam and the poverty of his companions, he drew a comparison with the time of 'Umar and said each one of the companions had become an emir of a city. "There is no prophethood not to be abolished by the "land". I will take refuge in God when prophets turn to be "kings" and I will seek God's shelter when I feel a great man in myself but be despicable in view of people. You

---

[1]. Tārīkh al-madīnat al-munawwara, vol.II, p.841

[2]. Nathr al-durr, vol.II, p.35; 'Uyūn al-akhbār, vol.I, p.12

[3]. Ḥayat al-ḥayawān, vol.I, p.49

[4]. Nathr al-durr, vol.IV, PP.34-35

[5]. Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā, vol.VIII, p.205

[6]. al-Aghānī, vol.VI, p.279

[7]. Huwiyyat al-tashayyu', p.47 from, al-Muṣannaf, Ibn Abī Shayba, Sunan Biyhaqī

[8]. Ibid. p.46 from, Taysīr al-uṣūl

will soon see emirs coming after us, and you will know them soon and will deny them."[1] It was a general attitude that time and many people were sure that the caliphate would turn into kingdom. 'Umar, himself, used to say he wondered whether he was a caliph or a king. Ka'b al-Aḥbār assured him he was a caliph and that he had found his name in the divine books![2] Apparently, Abū Bakr imagined himself a king.[3] Despite 'Umar's harsh behavior, many dared criticize him. When Bilāl was getting ready to say the Adhān, 'Umar objected to him, saying it was not time for prayers, but Bilāl responded, "I knew the time when you were more astray than the ass of your tribe."[4]

'Umar used to say, "Guide me if you see a fault in me."

A Bedouin Arab replied, "We will guide you with sword if we see a fault in you." Hearing this, 'Umar thanked God that there was somebody in the tribe to guide him by force.[5] On the contrary, 'Āyisha, daughter of 'Uthmān, believed that 'Umar's roughness prevented ordinary people from criticizing him.[6] 'Umar, himself, believed that the best policy for leading Muḥammad's nation was to act with power and not by force, to be soft but not lax, to bestow but not go to extremes, and to have abstinence but without stinginess.[7] We must admit that ruling Bedouin Arabs was not an easy task at all.

His strictness showed its signs in economy as well. He preferred a simple life for himself and for his functionaries and family. It seems that the Prophet's lifestyle was still common among people and some of the emirs. 'Umar had an extremist pious understanding of religion. A sign of this was his understanding of the verses, "أَذْهَبْتُمْ طَيِّبَاتِكُمْ فِي حَيَاتِكُمُ الدُّنْيَا." "You selfishly used your pure gifts in your worldly life,"[7] that allows Muslims to be so. Of course, he was objected to for this and when he learned that the verse concerned infidels,[8] he accepted it. His pious life did not mean that he had no wealth during his caliphate; rather, it has been mentioned in sources that 'Umar was among the wealthiest of the Quraysh.[9]

---

1. Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā, vol.VII, pp.6-7

2. Ḥayāt al-ṣaḥāba, vol.II, p.36; al-Tarātīb al-idāriyya, vol.I, p.13; Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.IV, p.211; Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā, vol.III, p.306

3. Ḥayāt al-ṣaḥāba, vol.III, pp.475-476

4. Mukhtaṣar Tārīkh Dimashq vol.XI, p.276

5. Tafsīr al-manār, vol.XI, p.266

6. Nathr al-durr, vol.IV, p.34

7. Tārīkh al-madīnat al-munawwara, vol.II, p.879; Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā, vol.III, pp.344-345

8. Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, vol.I, p.182

9. Kashf al-astār, vol.II, p.303; Ḥayāt al-ṣaḥāba, vol.I, p.347

Someone asked Nāfi', "Was 'Umar in debt?"

Nāfi' said, "How could he be in debt when one of his inheritors, alone, sold his inheritance at 100000 dhms (Dirham or Dīnār?)?[1] 'Umar had set his wife's marriage portion at 4000 dhms.[2] Also once, he bestowed tens of thousands of dhms from his original wealth to his son-in-law.[3] More pious than 'Umar was Salmān who warned him against luxury life.[4]

'UMAR'S FUNCTIONARIES

With the expansion of this period's conquests, vast lands fell under the rule of the Medina government. Running these lands needed managers with new values who could open the way for more conquests. In fact, the most important point for the caliph and Muslims in those conditions was further enlarging the conquered lands. For running the affairs of border regions, mostly those people were chosen who had enough military capability and experience. Thus, one of the main criteria of the caliph for selecting a functionary was someone with such an ability who could properly run the city and the region under his control. A list of 'Umar's functionaries in the cities was as follows, Mecca, Muḥriz Ibn Ḥāritha Ibn 'Abd Shams; Qunfudh Ibn 'Umayr Taymī; Nāfi' Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥārith Khuzā'ī; Khālid Ibn 'Āṣ Makhzumī;

Yemen, 'Abd Allāh Ibn Abī Rabi'a Makhzumī

Baḥrayn, 'Alā' Ḥaḍramī, Qudāmat Ibn Maẓ'ūn, 'Uthmān Ibn Abi l-'Āṣ, Abū Hurayrah, Ayyāsh Ibn Abī Thawr

'Ammān, Someone from the Anṣār and then 'Uthmān Ibn Abi l-'Āṣ

Baṣra, Shurayḥ Ibn 'Āmir, 'Utba Ibn Ghazwān, Mughīra Ibn Shu'ba, Abū Mūsā Ash'arī

Yamāma, Salama Ibn Sallāma Anṣārī

Kūfa, Sa'd Ibn Abī Waqqāṣ, 'Ammār Ibn Yāsir, Djubayr Ibn Muṭ'im, Mughīra Ibn Shu'ba

Ṭā'if, 'Uthmān Ibn Abi l-'Āṣ, Sufyān Ibn 'Abd Allāh Thaqafī

---

[1]. Tārikh al-madīnat al-munawwara, vol.II, p.935; Djāmi' al-bayān al-'ilm, vol.II, p.17

[2]. Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā, vol.VIII, p.464; al-Tarātīb al-idāriyya, vol.II, p.405; al-Baḥr al-zakhkhār, vol.III, p.101; Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.IV, p.190; al-Muṣannaf, Ibn Abī Shayba, vol.IV, p.190

[3]. Tārikh al-khulafā', p.120; Kanz al-'Ummāl, vol.II, p.317; Ḥayāt al-ṣaḥāba, vol.II, p.356

[4]. Mukhtaṣar Tārikh Dimashq, vol.X, p.46

Greater Syria, Abū 'Ubayda Djarrāḥ, Mu'ādh Ibn Djabal, Yazīd Ibn Abī Sufyān, Mu'āwiya Ibn Abī Sufyān[1]

Palestine, Yazīd Ibn Abī Sufyān, 'Amr Ibn 'Āṣ

Egypt, 'Amr Ibn 'Āṣ

Ḥidjāz and Ādharbāydjān, 'Ayāḍ Ibn Ghanam, Ḥabīb Ibn Maslama Fihrī, 'Umayr Ibn Sa'd Anṣārī [2]

It is said that for some time, Salmān used to rule Ctesiphon.[3]

As indicated by the above-mentioned names, 'Umar chose fewer people from among the companions to run the affairs. This issue was evident even in those days. Once he was asked about it, 'Umar answered he did not intend to corrupt them with executive affairs.[4] This has been quoted by several historians. Most answers are the same as mentioned.[5] But, Sha'bī who is the reliable source of the Sunnis, says, "'Umar did not allow the Muhādjir s to leave Medina and told them, "What I fear most is that you will become scattered in towns and cities." He has added, "If any of them asked permission to go to war, 'Umar would say, "As you have fought alongside the Prophet, that should suffice you."[6]

Also, Ḥasan Baṣrī says, "If any of the companions wanted to leave Medina, he had to seek 'Umar's permission."[7] Preventing the companions's exit, as some people have said, was not limited to the Quraysh; rather, he basically prevented the exit of those companions who could turn into a pivotal figure in any city and could somehow stand against the caliph. There was also another reason, 'Umar wanted to prevent the spread of the Prophet's hadiths in different towns and cities. Khaṭīb Baghdādī has narrated that 'Umar sent messages to Abu l-Dardā' Abū Mas'ūd Anṣārī and 'Abd Allāh Ibn Mas'ūd, saying, "What are all these hadiths you are quoting from Prophet Muḥammad?" Later, these people were not allowed to leave Medina[8] until 'Umar was killed. According to the same quote, Qarḍat Ibn Ka'b says, "When we were leaving Medina, 'Umar saw us off. Then, he asked, "Do you know why I am seeing you off? I wanted to tell you not to

---

[1]. Khalīfa Ibn Khayyāṭ makes it clear that Mu'āwiya ruled Greater Syria in ending years of 'Umar's caliphate.

[2]. Tārīkh khalīfat Ibn khayyāṭ, pp.153-156

[3]. Murūdj al-dhahab, vol.II, p.306

[4]. Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā, vol.III, p.499

[5]. al-Kāmil fī l-tārīkh, vol.II, p.361; Tārīkh al-khulafā', p.106

[6]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.III, p.397; Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, vol.II, pp.159-160

[7]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.III, p.396

[8]. Sharaf Aṣḥāb al-ḥadīth, p.87

narrate the hadiths of the Prophet for the people in the cities you go. I, too, am your partner." Qarḍat says, "Afterwards, I did not narrate any more hadiths."[1]

Preventing the exit of the companions and not employing them was a policy 'Umar followed carefully. People such as Sha'bī sought the problem of 'Uthmān in his policy which was exactly the opposite of 'Umar's. It is said that once, Zubayr asked 'Umar to let him take part in wars.

'Umar responded, "I will not allow the companions of the Prophet to go to different cities and mislead the people."[2] Also, it was once protested to him, "Why do you give the affairs to people such as Yazīd Ibn Abī Sufyān, Sa'īd Ibn 'Āṣ, Mu'āwiya and the like who are from the "طلقا" و "مؤلفة قلوبهم" "Those whose hearts are captured as well as those who are the liberated ones."

But you avoid using 'Alī, 'Abbās, Zubayr and Ṭalḥa?" 'Umar said he was afraid they would go stir trouble in cities.[3] Also, 'Abd al-Raḥmān Ibn 'Awf asked 'Umar, "Why don't you allow them to go to Djihād?" 'Umar said, "If I remain silent and refrain from answering your question, it would be better."[4] The unacceptable justification of Aḥmad Amīn is that it was due to the importance of Medina that 'Umar kept the Anṣār in the city.[5] This viewpoint is different from those of Sha'bī and Ḥasan Baṣrī!

Ibn Sa'd says, "'Umar appointed people such as 'Amr Ibn 'Āṣ, Mu'āwiya and Mughīra, but not people like 'Uthmān, 'Umar, Ṭalḥa, Zubayr and 'Abd al-Raḥmān Ibn 'Awf because the formers were strong and well-informed in executive affairs. Moreover, 'Umar dominated them and was an awful figure for them. When he was asked why he did not use the great companions of the Prophet, he would say,اكره ان ادنسهم بالعمل[6] "I please not to taint them with action."

We previously referred to the caliph's behavior. He preferred strict managers, even if they were not so virtuous. One of the problematic cities for 'Umar was the newly established city of Kūfa. For a period, it was ruled by Sa'd Ibn Abī Waqqāṣ who was removed following the people's protests. After him, 'Ammār Yāsir came to power, but he, too, was accused of

---

[1]. Sharaf Aṣḥāb al-ḥadīth, p.88

[2]. Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, vol.XX, p.20

[3]. Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, vol.IX, pp.29-30; al-Fitnat al-kubrā, pp.80-81

[4]. Tārīkh al-ya'qūbī, vol.II, p.158; there, he said that if Quraysh were permitted to leave, they would be led to the left and right wings.

[5]. Fadjr al-islām, p.172

[6]. Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā, vol.III, p.183and 283

impotence and 'Umar removed him. The next person was Djubayr Ibn Muṭ'im who again failed to stay in office. At this time, when 'Umar was greatly baffled, he asked Mughīra who he saw suitable for ruling Kūfa.

Mughīra said, "Appoint me as the city's governor."

'Umar answered, "You are a lewd man!"

Mughīra said, "My efficiency is for you and my lewdness for myself." 'Umar liked his response and appointed him as governor of Kūfa.[1] Before that, Mughīra had ruled Baṣra for a while. There, he had illicit relations with a married woman named Umm Djamīl. This affair was so explicit that four people saw him during adultery. But, only one of them gave false testimony and that saved Mughīra from being stoned. Different sources are unanimous that 'Umar had asked the fourth person to testify so.[2] 'Umar's policy of choosing such people caused Ḥudhayfa Ibn Yamān to protest to the caliph about his appointment of corrupt people.

'Umar answered, "I use his power (in running the affairs)."[3] Also, once, someone ho was a governor of Abū Mūsā Ash'arī in a region of Baḥrayn, came to Medina.

He asked Yarfa' Ḥādjib, "What character does 'Umar like best?"

He answered, "Toughness."

That man said, "When I attended the caliph's court, I took on a serious expression. It was then that I realized 'Umar paid more attention to me," after a while, he asked me.

"Where are you working now?" I answered.

'Umar said, "From now on, you are appointed in that region directly by me."[4]

One important point about 'Umar's functionaries was his supervision over their way of treating people and the Bayt al-Māl or the public treasury. 'Umar maintained a special control over them and recorded their wealth at the start of their term in office. In this concern, 'Umar considered almost all his functionaries[5] to be guilty and halved their belongings when they returned from the region of service. He gave half of the wealth to them and gave the other half to the Bayt al-Māl. This act is called the dividing in two

---

[1]. Tārīkh al-ya'qūbī, vol.II, p.155; al-'Iqd al-farīd, vol.I, p.22; Nathr al-durr, vol.II, p.80

[2]. Tārīkh al-ya'qūbī, vol.II, p.146; al-Muṣannaf, 'Abd al-Razzāq, vol.VII, pp.384-385; al-Aghānī, vol.XVI, P.94. about other cases, al-Muṣannaf, 'Abd al-Razzāq, vol.VIII, p.217-219

[3]. Gharīb al-ḥadīth, vol.III, p.239; al-Fā'iq, vol.III, p.215

[4]. al-'Iqd al-farīd, vol.I, pp.14-15

[5]. For example, he accused Abū Hurayra of theft. Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā, vol.IV, p.335

halves of the wealth. It was natural for 'Umar to believe that his functionaries had gathered the wealth illegally, but as he did not know a particular way for separating the legal from the illegal, he had decided to divide the wealth as mentioned except in a few cases. One of these governors was Abū Hurayra who ruled Baḥrayn. When he returned from his mission, 'Umar divided his wealth and ordered him to be punished. Then, 'Umar asked him to go back to work! Abū Hurayra said he would not accept to return because his money had been seized, he had been disgraced and he had been beaten as well![1]

'Amr Ibn 'Āṣ, too, saw his wealth divided.[2] Other people to have the same fate were Abū Mūsā Ash'arī, Ḥārith Ibn Ka'b and 'Utba Ibn Sufyān who were in charge of collecting alms in Ṭā'if.[3]

Abū Bakra was another governor whose wealth was divided. He protested to 'Umar and said, "If all these riches belong to God, who don't you take them all and if they are mine, why are you doing so, then?"[4] As we said earlier, after dividing the wealth of his functionaries, 'Umar re-appointed them to their posts. Imām 'Alī has been quoted as having the same protest of Abū Bakr about why the functionaries were returned to work. One such instance was that one of 'Umar's functionaries had returned from Yemen, wearing an exquisite robe. But, 'Umar ordered his attire to be taken off and ordered him to go back to his post.[5] Also, 'Umar once heard that his governor in the city of Ḥimṣ had built a nice house and had set a door- keeper for it. 'Umar sent someone to burn the door of his house, but after a while, sent him back to work.[6] This act even trapped people such as Sa'd Ibn Abī Waqqāṣ. Balādhurī has provided a list of those governors whose wealth was divided, Nāfi' Ibn Ḥārith, Nafi' Ibn Ḥārith, Bushr Ibn Muḥtafar, Djaz Ibn Mu'āwiya, Khālid Ibn Ḥārith, Qays Ibn 'Āṣim, Samura Ibn Djundab, Mudjāshi' Ibn Mas'ūd, Shibl Ibn Ma'bad and Abū Maryam Ibn Muḥrash. These people, as said by Balādhurī, were mostly responsible for collecting alms in the cities.[7] Of course, the names of people such as Salmān and 'Ammār Ibn Yāsir are included on the list.

Controlling his functionaries was a principle in 'Umar's policies. This supervision mostly focused on the financial aspect. When 'Umar heard that

---

[1]. 'Uyūn al-akhbār, vol.I, pp.53-54; Futūḥ al-buldān, p.93; al-'Iqd al-farīd, vol.I, p.45

[2]. Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā, vol.IV, p.335

[3]. Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, vol.I, p.175

[4]. al-'Iqd al-farīd, vol.I, p.46

[5]. Ibid.vol.I, p.46

[6]. Nahdj al-sa'āda, vol.I, p.112

[7]. Ḥayāt al-ṣaḥāba, vol.II, p.210; from, Kanz al-'Ummāl, vol.III, p.166

'Amr Ibn 'Āṣ had taken some money from the Bayt al-Māl, he wrote to him, "I knew people from the Muhādjirūn who were much better than you, but I appointed you thinking that you had little need." After that, 'Umar sent Muḥammad Ibn Maslama to divide the wealth of 'Amr Ibn 'Āṣ.[1] Another quotation says once 'Umar heard that 'Ayaḍ Ibn Ghanam was living a luxurious life, wearing exquisite clothes and eating delicious meals. He sent Muḥammad Ibn Maslama to fetch him. When 'Ayaḍ came, 'Umar gave him a walking stick and a robe. Then, he tasked him with taking three hundred sheep to the pasture. He was looking after the sheep for two months. Once, 'Ayāḍ decided to get rid of his situation with the mediation of 'Umar's wife. When 'Umar found out, he harshly told his wife, "This is not your business! You are a mere means of joy that is discarded after having fun.[2] Now, you are meddling in the affairs of me and Muslims?" Then, with 'Uthmān's arbitration, 'Umar sent 'Ayaḍ back to his post and committed him not to return to his previous situation.[3]

Sometimes, 'Umar would go to the house of his agents, accompanied by someone. He would remain silent and his friend would ask permission for entry. Then, he entered the house unexpectedly and this way, he tried to supervise their way of life.[4] In one occasion, he heard that Sa'd Ibn Abī Waqqāṣ had built a palace and had set a portal for the building. 'Umar sent someone to Kūfa to set the gate on fire.[5] Of course, some of 'Umar's functionaries lived luxurious lives, but 'Umar was not strict with them. two instances were 'Amr Ibn 'Āṣ and Yazīd Ibn Abī Sufyān.[6] This could have been due to his trust in their management skills. In some cases, too, he had special interest in certain persons. For example, he was greatly fond of Zayd Ibn Thābit. Once, Abū Bakr asked 'Umar to appoint Zayd, then a teenager, to a post in financial affairs. When 'Umar came to power and Zayd returned to him with some money, 'Umar bestowed on Zayd all the money he had brought with him.[7] One day, 'Umar heard that Abū Mūsā Ash'arī had lashed one of the fighters of the army and had shaved his head. He wrote to Abū Mūsā that if he had done this in public, he must receive Qiṣāṣ or get retaliatory punishment in public. And, if he had done it secretly, again he

---

[1]. Futūḥ al-buldān, pp.90,299 and 396

[2]. انما انت لعبته يلعب بك، ثم تتركين No doubt, you are his plaything and finally thrown away

[3]. Tārikh al-madīnat al-munawwara, vol.III, p.817; Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, vol.I, P.178(with a little difference)

[4]. Ibid.vol.III, p.836

[5]. Akhbār al-ṭiwāl, p.124; Futūḥ al-buldān, p.277

[6]. Tārikh al-madīnat al-munawwara, vol.III, p.8333

[7]. Ibid.vol.III, pp.854-855; al-Iṣāba, vol.I, p.85

would have to be punished in the same manner. When Abū Mūsā was getting ready for Qiṣāṣ, the lashed man forgave him.[1]

At any rate, 'Umar's orders and letters to the governors of different lands, his questioning of the emirs of cities and his urging them to observe justice, have been mentioned in numerous occasions by various sources.[2] This situation, whatever reason it had, did not last after 'Umar. 'Uthmān, during his years of caliphate, left his functionaries to themselves. This prevented a personality such as Imām 'Alī from controlling the situation.

The narrator says, "Once, some money was brought to 'Umar. His child took one dhm, put it in its mouth and went away. 'Umar went after him and took the money." The narrator adds, "I was sitting with 'Uthmān when some money was brought to him, His child took a coin and then, his servant took one, but he did not protest. I burst into tears. When 'Uthmān asked the reason, I told him the story.

'Uthmān said, "'Umar did not give to his relatives for God's sake, but I am giving to my folks for God's sake."[3]

Among his functionaries, 'Umar did not question one particular person. He was Mu'āwiya, son of Abū Sufyān who had converted to Islam even later than his father. Appointing Mu'āwiya as the governor of Damascus

---

[1]. Tārikh al-madīnat al-munawwara.vol.III, p.809

[2]. See a collection of commands, letters and speeches in,

Sharh nahdj al-balāgha, Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, vol.XII, pp.194-196. He wrote to the people of cities, "I have not sent my agents to oppress you or seize your property. I've sent them to teach you religion and tradition. Anyone iolated this, complain to me for retaliating him because I saw the Prophet(s) doing so, Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, vol.XII, p.22 and for treating harshly that is because of lack of understanding the Qur'ānic verses, Ibid.vol.XII, pp.15 and 17

[3]. al-Amālī fī Āthār al-ṣaḥāba, pp.53-54; the heritage the Sunnites know as biography of "Orthodox Caliphs" excluding what Imām 'Alī said and reflected more in culture of Shia belongs not to Abū Bakr and 'Uthmān but to 'Umar. What history tells of this heritage is legion and the Sunnites typically adopted its acceptability through 'Umar's letters and catch phrases. It is to admitted that, apart from caliph's certain matters concerned with Imamate, the Hāshimites and some juriprudic rulers as well as religious values, what persists has had and still has a high place in contrast to 'Umar's, the Umayya's and the 'Abbāsids's biography. The Sunnites refomists portrayed this considerably and undeniably. See, Tārikh falsafih dar islām, vol.II, article on "Tafakkur siyāsī dar ṣadr islām" is maily vested upon the same acceptability transferred from 'Umar and presented an idealistic image of the Islamic government and principles of Islamic policy. The caliph held that the assets of Bayt al-Māl are not privately owned but it is divine property,"Māl Allāh" at his disposal(Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā, vol.III, pp.275-276) while 'Uthmān regarded it as personal propewrty, 'Umar Himself moved around the city as a "night guard"(Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā, vol.III, p.281)

during the last six years of 'Umar's caliphate was one of the sensitive issues of that time. The caliph was accused of playing a major role in stabilizing the status of the Umayya in Damascus.

'Umar did not remove Mu'āwiya from office when he called him the Arab Caesar.[1] Once, 'Umar told Mu'āwiya that he did not abide by enjoining to good and forbidding from evil.[2] During 'Umar's rule, the entire Damascus was under Mu'āwiya's control.[3] Even at the time of death, 'Umar told the six-man council, "Do not have differences with each other because Mu'āwiya is in Damascus![4]

Also, Qāḍī 'Abd al-Djabbār, a fanatic Sunnites, says, "Although 'Umar strictly controlled his agents and sometimes changed them, he never had such a behavior towards Mu'āwiya."[5]

Abū Bakr Aṣam said, "Mu'āwiya was rightful in his war against 'Alī because 'Umar had appointed him."[6] Later, 'Umar's political and religious conduct turned into a tradition. Once, when there was a dispute between Ṭalḥa and Imām 'Alī over a pitcher at the presence of 'Uthmān.

Mu'āwiya asked, "Did it exist at the time of 'Umar?"

They said, "Yes."

He answered, "Can you change something which was fixed during 'Umar's period?"[7]

Before Mu'āwiya, his brother, Yazīd, was the governor of parts of Damascus. This issue began at the time of Abū Bakr. When he appointed Khālid Ibn Sa'īd as the commander of an army in Damascus, 'Umar insisted that he be replaced with Yazīd Ibn Abī Sufyān because Khālid Ibn Sa'īd who was in Yemen on behalf of Prophet Muḥammad, returned after the Prophet's demise and complained to Imām 'Alī about Abū Bakr's coming to power. That was why 'Umar preferred Yazīd Ibn Sufyān to him.[8] After Yazīd's death, Mu'āwiya succeeded him and ruled Damascus during the last

---

[1]. Nathr al-durr, vol.II, p.61; al-'Iqd al-farīd, vol.III, p.365

[2]. Dalā'il al-ṣidq, vol.III, p.312 quoted from Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.VI, p.184

[3]. Tārīkh khalīfat Ibn khayyāṭ, vol.I, p.157. This is against the idea of Ibn Kathīr who believes that 'Umar had him control some parts of greater Syria. al-Bidāya wa l-nihāya, vol.III, p.124

[4]. Nathr al-durr, vol.II, p.37

[5]. Tathbīt Dalā'il al-nubuwwa, p.593

[6]. Masā'il al-imāma, p.60

[7]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol. IV, p.499, No.1286; Ibn 'Āṣākir mentions various evidence concerningly. Mukhtaṣar Tārīkh Dimashq, vol.XXV, pp.18-25 and 44-73

[8]. al-Muṣannaf, 'Abd al-Razzāq, vol.V, p.454

four years of 'Umar's caliphate.[1] Djāḥiẓ has interesting interpretations about the gradual reinforcement of Mu'āwiya's position in Damascus from the time of Abū Bakr until 'Uthmān.[2]

Among the caliph's agents, apart from Mughīra, there were other lewd people, too. One of them was Qudāma Ibn Maẓ'ūn who was a drunkard and was lashed for this.[3] Another governor of 'Umar, Nu'mān Ibn 'Adī, wrote poems on wine and drunkenness.[4] It was reported to 'Umar that Nu'mān ran the affairs in the best possible way, but did not say his prayers on time.[5]

At the end of this part, it would be suitable to mention some other points considered by the caliph in choosing his agents. During his early years in Iraq and Damascus, 'Umar showed that if he did not choose his commanders from among the noble companions, he could not go beyond the limits of the Quraysh and their allies such as the Thaqif and sometimes, the Anṣār who were trusted by the Quraysh. Therefore, despite the fact that Muthannā Ibn Ḥāritha had grown his power in Iraq and was apparently trusted, 'Umar did not appoint him as commander in the war against Iranians. Also, when 'Utba Ibn Ghazwān, the founder of the city of Baṣra, complained to 'Umar about the way Sa'd Ibn Abī Waqqāṣ was enjoining to good and forbidding from evil, 'Umar told him why he was not willing to accept the rule of someone from the Quraysh. Moreover, 'Umar tried to choose his agents from the cities not from nomadic tribes. Once 'Umar heard from Utba that he had appointed Mudjāshi' Ibn Mas'ūd as his successor in Baṣra and as Mudjāshi' had not been available then, had appointed Mughīra Ibn Shu'ba.

In response, 'Umar said, "It is better that Mughīra rules Baṣra, not Mudjāshi' because Mudjāshi' is from nomads and Mughīra is a city-dweller."[6] Mughīra was a Thaqafī residing in Ṭā'if.

THOUGHTS OF THE SECOND CALIPH

The second caliph, more than any other personality, influenced the Sunnites thoughts and ideas. As his period of caliphate was a highly crucial juncture in the history of Islam, his thoughts and deeds, too, were of great significance for Sunnites Muslims. This is to the extent that he is considered as a role model who made no mistakes and every word or act of him can be

---

1. Tārīkh al-madīnat al-munawwara, vol.III, p.838
2. Rasā'il al-djāḥiẓ, al-Rasāil al-siyāsiyya, p.344
3. al-Ishtiqāq, p.13; al-Fā'iq, vol.I, P.431; Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā, vol.V, p.560-561
4. Muṣ'ab Zubayrī, Nasab Quraysh, p.382
5. Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā, vol.V, p.560
6. Mu'djam al-buldān, vol.I, p.432

trusted as a religious tradition. Therefore, it is necessary to talk about him here.

The high status of 'Umar in Sunnites thinking, can not be compared to anyone else. In the narrations told about 'Umar's good traits, the ranking attributed to him is a little lower than prophethood! This status has been interpreted as "Muḥaddath". Muḥaddath is said to be someone who receives "revelations".

In a narration by Bukhārī, Muslim and others, Abū Hurayra has been quoted as saying Prophet Muḥammad said, "There were people among the Israelian tribe who received revelations without being a prophet. If there is anyone in my Umma who is such, that person is certainly 'Umar." According to Qasṭalānī, the commentator of the book of Bukhārī, the "if" in the above-mentioned sentence, does not mean "hesitation" but means "emphasis".

Besides such quotations, there is, on the whole, a certain idea about the caliph's measures at the Prophet's time, indicating that before God revealed something, 'Umar had ordered that and then, God had sent down some verses in that regard. These instances are known as "'Umar's Muwāfiqāt", 'Umar's agreement. It is interesting that in some cases, the viewpoint of the Prophet was in conflict with 'Umar's, but God has sent down verses agreeing with 'Umar's idea! 'Abd Allāh Ibn 'Umar has been quoted as saying that all the verses God sent down about something discussed by 'Umar and others, were in accordance with 'Umar's idea. Some of such examples are saying prayers for Ibrāhīm, the verse of Ḥidjāb, the Badr captives, banning drinking, not saying prayers for hypocrites and so on. It is evident, then, why 'Umar's status was close to prophethood and later, his way of behavior was regarded superior even to that of the Prophet.

Here, we must note the point that 'Umar was as strong in practice as he was weak in thought. He, himself, had admitted this several times and had sought help from others in solving his problems. 'Allama Amīnī has allocated almost half of the sixth volume of the book of al-Ghadīr entitled, نوادر الاثر في علم عمر "Rare reports about knowledge of 'Umar," on these issues. It was due to this weakness in knowledge that 'Umar did not like religious discussions and debates and once, when someone asked him the meaning of وَالذّٰرِيَات ذَرْوًا. "I Swear to pollinating winds," 'Umar beat him up.[1]

One of the main features of the second caliph's thinking was that he saw himself entitled to vast authorities as a ruler. He considered a special right for himself, not only in political and executive affairs, but also in divine legislation and making laws. Relying on the same authorities during his

---

[1]. al-Ibāna 'An sharī'a al-firqa al-nādjiya, vol.I, p.415; 'Aqīda al-salaf Aṣḥāb al-ḥadīth, Abū 'Uthmān Ismā'il Ibn 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-Ṣābūnī, pp.67-68

caliphate, 'Umar made innovations and changes and did not deem himself obliged to anything except having a general knowledge of the Qur'ān and the Sharī'a. In cases where he found himself incompetent, he would hold consultations and deliberations with the Companions to get things done. Narrating an interesting story told by Ṭabarī is appropriate here to realize the caliph's idea about his authorities, "'Imrān Ibn Sawād says, "I said the morning prayers with 'Umar and then, followed him."

He asked, "You have a request?"

I said, "Yes, advice!"

He said, "Bravo! Go on!"

I said, "People find faults with you in several things."

Holding his lash under his chin, 'Umar said, "Well?"

I said, "You have forbidden the lesser pilgrimage (the 'Umra Ḥadjdj) during the months of Ḥadjdj while Prophet Muḥammad said it was permitted; neither did Abū Bakr act like you."

'Umar said, "This was to show people that they were not exempt from the main Ḥadjdj by doing the 'Umra."

I asked, "You have banned the temporary marriage of women while the Prophet had allowed it?"

'Umar said, "I am equal to Muḥammad; I make them full and do so and so for them. If I do not do so (harsh behavior), I'll abandon the truth (this is ironical of his having right to do so)."[1]

There are two basic points in this quotation containing plenty of proof for approving its inclusion, One is that 'Umar, in response to 'Imrān, confirmed his disagreement with the Prophet (s) and also justified it. Second, his response to 'Imrān's last objection started with this sentence, أنا زميل محمّد (ص) "I am equal to the Prophet." "Zamīl" commonly means "classmate" and its old usage is referred to two people who ride on camels each of whom takes seat on one side or two people ride on two camels separately.

In the above statement, there is an opposite sentence that says, وكان زامله في غزوة قرقرة الكدر "'Umar has 'Umar been equal to the Prophet in Qarqarat al-Kudr war."

This sentence had no relation with 'Umar's response to the questions raised[2] but on the contrary, it was really misleading and was intentionally aimed at misleading the minds. 'Umar says he is equal to the Prophet,

---

[1]. Tārikh al-ṭabarī, vol.IV, p.225; Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, Sharh nahdj al-balāgha, vol.XII, pp.121-122; al-Fā'iq fi gharīb al-ḥadith, vol.I, pp.433-434(above translation in brief)

[2]. Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd presents a worse justification, vol.XII, p.124

meaning he could enjoin to or forbid from something or label things as lawful or unlawful just as the Prophet could. Thus, the caliph considered his authorities as vast as the Prophet and pretended to believe in nothing but the Qur'ān.

What has been said about the caliph's ban on narrating hadith and writing it[1] exactly conforms to this idea of the caliph. It seems the caliph believed that only the Qur'ān could remain unchanged, but not hadith and the ruler can act at any time based on his expedience. In other words, what has been quoted from Prophet Muḥammad, only refer to his authorities as a ruler and these are authorities 'Umar, too, had as a ruler. It is unlikely to find any caliph other than 'Umar and 'Uthmān who considered their authorities to include divine legislation and interference in religious affairs. Naṣr Allāh Munshī, in the preface to "Kelīlih wa Dimnih", quotes 'Umar as saying, "What the "state" bans people from is prior to what the "Qur'ān" prohibits."[2] 'Umar cut the share of المؤلفة قلوبهم "Those whose hearts are captured," that God paid from the tax alms, saying, Islam has no fear of them any more.[3] He believed an unclean person who needs water should not say prayers if he cannot find water. When 'Ammār Yāsir taught him the Prophet's tradition in Tayammum (making ablution with earth or sand), اتق الله يا عمار "O 'Ammār! Fear God!"

'Ammār answered, "If you please so, I will not tell you the hadith of the Prophet!"[4]

It is interesting that 'Umar hated Tayammum even during the Prophet's life. Once during a trip, someone from 'Umar's companions got impure at dawn and had to make Tayammum. 'Umar objected to him.

When they got to Medina, 'Umar complained about him to the Prophet, but the Prophet said, "I would have done the same if I were in his conditions."[5] Of course, if nothing occurred to his mind, 'Umar would follow the Prophet's Sunna.[6]

Ibn 'Abbās says, "During the time of the Prophet and Abū Bakr and in two years of 'Umar's caliphate, if someone divorced his wife three times, it

---

[1]. Muqaddamihyī bar tārīkh tadwīn ḥadīth (An Introduction to History of Compiling Hadith) by the author of the same context

[2]. Mīnawī, Translation of Kilīlih wa Dimnih, p.4

[3]. al-Tarātīb al-idāriyya, vol.I, p.228; al-Īḍāḥ, p.97

[4]. al-Ghadīr, vol.VI, pp.83-85 from, Sunan Abū Dāwūd, vol.I, p.53; Sunan Ibn Mādja, vol.I, p.200; Musnad Aḥmad, vol.IV, p.265; Sunan Nasā'ī, vol.I, pp.59 and 61; Sunan Biyhaqī, voil.I, p.209 and other sources

[5]. Futūḥ Miṣr wa Akhbāruhā, p.249

[6]. Musnad Aḥmad, vol.I, pp.190 and 195

would be considered once. But, 'Umar considered it three divorces.[1] Mālik Ibn Anas, Imām of Mālikiyya, narrates, "'Umar was afraid that a non-Arab would receive inheritance from an Arab unless he was born among Arabs!"[2]

These were the caliph's personal Idjtihāds which were mostly based on his favored "interests". Temporary marriage during Ḥadjdj and temporary marriage of women are among the main religious affairs allowed by Prophet Muḥammad, but banned by the caliph.[3] As we mentioned, 'Umar believed these affairs were permissible at the time of the Prophet due to certain necessity. Another example is dropping the line "Ḥayya 'Alā Khayr al-'Amal" (Rush to the best deed) from the Adhān[4] whereas people such as 'Abd Allāh Ibn 'Umar and Imām Sadjdjād always said this line in the call to prayers.[5] Word has it that 'Umar was the first person to initiate the rising of Ramaḍān. He did it in the 14th year of Hidjra and ordered all towns and cities to do so.[6] This is the same nightly prayers of Ramaḍān still common among Sunnis. Because 'Umar saw himself entitled to such authorities, he issued contradictory rulings in some cases. Such instances can be found in the issue of inheritance.[7]

Such freedom of action in religious affairs could entail more claim of authority in non-religious domains. The caliph did not avoid innovation. The Amīr al-Mu'minīn, too, had innovations in solving the mentioned issues but his faithfulness to the wording came first. The sudden expansion of Islamic countries at the time of 'Umar brought him face to face with numerous problems, so he often tried to find a solution to his problems even if through consultation with the Companions. The collection of such solutions which were first based on the Prophet's heritage, second on consultations with the Companions and third, on the caliph's innovations, led to the enlargement of the state authority.

---

1. al-Ghadīr, vol.VIII, pp.178-180 from, Musnad Aḥmad, vol.I, p.314; Ṣaḥīḥ Mulsim, vol.I, p.574; Sunan Biyhaqī, ol.VII, P.336; Mustadrak Ḥākim, vol.II, p.196; Tafsīr Qurubī, vol.III, p.130; Irshād al-sārī, vol.VIII, p.127; Durr al-manthūr, vol.I, p.279 and other sources

2. al-Muwaṭṭa', ol.II, p.12

3. See the sources in works of the Sunnites in, al-Ghadīr, vol.VI, pp.198-213 and more, Tārikh al-madīnat al-munawwara, vol.I, pp.716-720

4. Imām Sadjdjād(a) said,, "Due to people remaining strong in Djihād 'Umar removed the sentence, حي علي خيرالعمل "Haste for good deed" From Azān; Kitāb al-'Ilm, vol.I, p.92

5. al-Sīrat al-ḥalabiyya, vol.II, p.110

6. Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā, vol.III, p.281

7. Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, vol.I, p.181

Comparing the successful policy of 'Umar and Mu'āwiya with that of Imām 'Alī, Aḥmad Amīn says the former two considered themselves free in interpreting religious texts while 'Alī believed in them.[1] Also, Suhayl Zakkār has referred to the point that 'Umar saw himself entitled to interpret new issues.[2] His instructions to Shurayḥ are also considerable for following the rules.[3]

As mentioned earlier, one principle of the caliph's thoughts was that he tried to only rely on the Qur'ān as proof, so he ignored hadiths. His remark which said, حسبنا كتاب الله[4] "We relied on the Book of Allāh."

This has been cited in many historical and hadith sources and implies nothing other than there is no need for hadith. Of course, this has no contradiction with 'Umar's use of the Prophet's quotations if he could not think of a certain solution. However, in return, he would do something if it were to his interest even if Prophet Muḥammad had a special belief in that regard.

One such clear example was a wording about the Imamate of Imām 'Alī that was said by the Prophet. Not only 'Umar, but other people from the companions, too, set aside the words due to some expediency they claimed.

Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd says, "I asked my master about texts on the Imamate of 'Alī and said, "Is it really possible that they have set aside the Prophet's words?"

He answered, "Those people do not consider caliphate among religious decrees such as daily prayers and fasting, but consider it a worldly affair and an issue like running the land, planning the war and ruling the subjects. In these cases, too, if they saw it to their benefit, they would oppose the word of the Prophet. For example, the Prophet ordered Abū Bakr and 'Umar to join the army of Usāma, but they refused to do so as they did not see it agreeable to the state interests. These happened during Prophet Muḥammad's lifetime, he saw them and did not deny them!... The

---

[1]. Ẓahr al-islām,vol.IV, p.38

[2]. Tārikh al-'arab wa l-islām, p.88

[3]. Djāmi' al-bayān al-'ilm wa Faḍla, vol.II, pp.79-72

[4]. 'Umar said this on Yawm al-khamīs event when the Prophet asked for pen and paper to write something to prevent people from going astray after he is dead.

About the sources, 'Alī-Bukhārī, Kitāb al-'Ulūm, Bāb Kitāb al-'Ulūm; Kitāb al-Djihād, Bāb Hal yastashfa' Ilā ahl al-dhamma wa bāb Ikhrādj al-yahūd min djazīra al-'arab; Kitāb hglaghāzī; Bāb maraḍ al-Nabī; Kitāb al-marḍā, Bāb qawl al-marīḍ: Qūmū 'Annī, kitāb hg-I'tiṣām, Bāb kirāhiyya al-khalāf, al-Muṣannaf, 'Abd al-Razzāq, vol.V, p.438 and 439; Musnad Aḥmad, vol.I, p.336; Dalā'il al-nubuwwa, vol.VII,p.183; Djāmi' al-bayān al-'ilm, vol.I, p.77; Kanz al-'Ummāl, vol.X,p.292, hadith, 29475; for more sources, Tadwīn al-sunna al-sharīfa, Fihrist Muṣṭalaḥāt, under, Ḥasbunā kitāb Allāh

companions, collectively and individually, neglected many words of Prophet Muḥammad and this was due to the interests they saw in doing so such as the shares of ذوي القربى والمؤلفة قلوبهم "Relatives and those whose hearts are captured."

They acted according to their own will in many issues not mentioned by the Qur'ān and the Sunna such as the limit of drinking wine,.... They preferred their interests to the Prophet's words, saying, "If you find it right, do it..."

As for the Prophet's words about 'Alī, they (in fact, Abū Bakr and 'Umar) said that Arabs would not accept his rule due to several reasons. Therefore, they agreed not to give him the power because they saw that Arabs would not obey him. So, they interpreted the Prophet's words; however, they did not deny the word. They just said someone present can see something which the absent person cannot. The Anṣār's act, too, helped them. So, they made allegiance with Abū Bakr to eliminate the Anṣār's conspiracy. And later, in the face of 'Alī's protests, they said that he was too young, Arabs would not accept him, ...and that Abū Bakr was an old man, he was experienced, Arabs love him, etc. They said if they had chosen 'Alī, Arabs would have turned apostate and ...Which way was to their interests? Following the Prophet's words and getting ready for Arabs' apostasy and the return of the Dark Age or deviating from the Prophet's words and safeguarding Islam...People, too, remained silent...

Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd says, "My master, Abū Dja'far Naqīb, did not believe in Imām and did not obey them. Neither did he accept the words of Shi'ites fanatics. Yet, he had such an analysis.[1]

At any rate, this point must be taken into consideration that when 'Umar took the reins of caliphate, it was necessary to expand the administrative organization of the new government. Further conquests and enlargement of the lands under his rule as well as wars and peace deals forced him to forge some laws in order to run his affairs. These measures are listed by Kattānī in the book of "al-Tarātīb al-Idāriyya " (Administrative Arrangements). Many of his measures took on a jurisprudent aura and in later texts of Sunnis, were used as the basis of Sunnites jurisprudence. Most of his edicts have been collected in the book of "al-Muṣannaf" by 'Abd al-Razzāq Ṣanānī. Ibn Kathīr, too, has gathered these edicts in a book entitled "Musnad 'Umar" ('Umar's Throne).

It was during his period that for the first time, the title of "Amīr al-Mu'minīn" or "Commander of the Faithful" became a common term to refer to the caliph. Before that, he was called "Khālifa Rasūl Allāh" or the "Caliph of the Prophet". But, according to quotations, he got the title of

---

[1]. Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, vol.XII, pp.82-90

Amīr al-Mu'minīn in the year 17 A.H. from either Mughīra Ibn Shu'ba, Abū Mūsā Ash'arī or 'Adī Ibn Ḥātim.[1]

One the caliph's measures which had an important role in organizing the ruling system and establishing the government was the formation of "Dīwāns" in the year 20 A.H.[2] Prophet Muḥammad was a pioneer in registering the names of Muslims, especially fighters.[3] 'Umar ordered the registration of the Companions and classified them based on tribal origins and religious records.[4] Then, he divided the huge booties gained during conquests. 'Umar began with the Hāshimites and among them, with 'Abd al-Muṭṭalib.[5] The policy of the Prophet and Abu Bakr differed with 'Umar's policy[6] in that they divided the riches equally while 'Umar's division was based on different tribes and the people's record in Islam. It is said that 'Umar objected to Abū Bakr for observing equality.[7] This act of the caliph led to the reinforcement of tribal strata among Arabs based on which, some tribes claimed superiority over others. This remark of Maqdisī who has quoted 'Umar as saying that he had learnt justice from Chosroe[8] gives strength to the probability that he had been somehow influenced by the Iranian system of social classification, though there is no other evidence to prove this claim. Word has said that towards the end of his life, 'Umar doubted the rightfulness of this method and said if he lived more, he would act equally towards all people.[9]

Also, an accurate date that was necessary for administrative affair was set in 'Umar's time. We mentioned elsewhere that during consultations with the companions, he acted according to the opinion of Imām 'Alī based on choosing the date of the Prophet's Ḥidjra as the beginning date of Muslims'

---

[1]. Tārikh al-ya'qūbī, vol.II, p.150; Murūdj al-dhahab, vol.II, p.305; al-Futūḥ, vol.I, p.157

[2]. Tārikh al-ya'qūbī, vol.II, p.153

[3]. Tarātīb al-idāriyya, vol.I, p.227. Some believe the Prophet has initiated preparing administrative tribunal. Ibid. p.228. Some others consider 'Umar's policy in preparing it affected by monarchy system

Tārikh al-ṭabarī, vol.IV, p.209. Some people regard it to be influenced by the Sassanid government; al-Fakhrī, p.38

[4]. Kattānī writes in defining administrative tribunal, دفتر يكتب فيه أسماء اهل العطاء والعساكر على القبائل والبطون He had an account book in which he registered names of those who deserve to be gifted according to tribes. Tarātīb al-idāriyya, vol.I, p.225

[5]. Tārikh al-ya'qūbī, vol.II, p.153

[6]. Tarātīb al-idāriyya, vol. I, p.226

[7]. Ḥayāt al-ṣaḥāba, vol.II, p.222

[8]. Aḥsan al-taqāsim, p.18

[9]. Tārikh al-ya'qūbī, vol.II, p.154

history. This was a significant step towards creating administrative discipline.

About the sources of the second caliph's religious and political thoughts, we must note another point. Besides what he had gained from Islamic teachings, 'Umar tried to enrich his thoughts from other sources, too. One of these sources was the knowledge of the people of the book and Jews had plenty of such knowledge in Hidjāz. First of all, we must admit that among different Islamic sects, there is a common accusation about 'Umar's use of Jewish knowledge, mostly due to the reason that Jews were greatly despised by the Qur'ān and naturally, by Muslims. We should know that the people of the book in general and Jews, in particular, have left some traces in the historical texts and hadiths of Muslims. This influence is more or less seen among almost all sects. Any way, there are some texts available that indicate the people of the book tried to grab a position for themselves in the new society by relying on the knowledge they already possessed and the cultural influence they had inherited from the era of ignorance. Their religious texts had many things in common with Islam and it was on this basis that they claimed to have some knowledge about the interpretation of the Qur'ān. Moreover, they said that in the earlier texts, the Prophet's ordainment had been announced. They went on as far as claiming that in divine books, there had a lot of information about the trend of developments in the Islamic society, the story of caliphs, events and wars. Muslims' belief in this issue made it much easier for the people of the book. We had better set aside our general discussion in this regard, which has also been reiterated by Ibn Khadlūn[1] and return to our main topic.

When the Muslim Muhādjir s came to Medina and Islam spread in the city, the ground was prepared for a cultural relation between Islam and Judaism due to their common origins.

A quotation says, كانت اليهود يحدثون اصحاب رسول الله "The Jews spoke with the companions of the Prophet (s)." When Prophet Muḥammad heard of that, he said, "Do not confirm or deny them."[2] But, it seems that gradually, things got more serious until the Prophet banned the companions from listening to Jews or copying their works.

When he came to Medina, the second caliph decided to use the people of the book to increase his religious and historical knowledge.

He says, "I copied one of the works of the people of the book so as to add to my knowledge." The Prophet was really angered to the extent that the Anṣār shouted, "al-Silāḥ! al-Silāḥ!", meaning "Weapon! Weapon!"

---

[1]. al-Muqaddama, Chapter of the 'Ilm al-tafsīr

[2]. al-Muṣannaf, 'Abd al-Razzāq, vol.VI, p.111

Then, the Prophet said, "I have brought everything for you."[1] Elsewhere, 'Umar has been quoted as telling Prophet Muḥammad, "I came across a "brother from Qurayẓa" who copied the Torah for me. Shall I offer it to you?" This question angered the Prophet.[2]

Zuhrī says, "Ḥafṣa, 'Umar's daughter and the Prophet's wife, brought to the Prophet a book of stories about Joseph and read out the book. At the same moment, the Prophet's face turned red with anger and he said, "I swear by God that if Joseph and I were among you and you followed him and abandoned me, you would be mistaken."[3] The fact that 'Umar and his daughter tried at the time of the Prophet to read the texts of other religions could not have been a mere incidence. This issue is clarified with the point told by Ibn Shahāb Zuhrī about 'Umar's naming as Fārūq, the distinguisher.

He says, "The first people to call 'Umar as Fārūq were the people of the book while no news has reached us to indicate that the Prophet called him so."[4]

When 'Umar came to power, he pondered in this regard with more peace of mind and right at the time when he encountered a Muslim-turned Jew from Yemen, he could benefit from him more. This person was Ka'b Ibn Māti' Ḥimyarī known as Ka'b al-Aḥbār.[5] He converted to Islam after the Prophet's demise at the time of Abū Bakr or 'Umar and then came to Medina. Later, he took permission from the caliph and headed to Damascus. It seems that his departure to Damascus and at the time of the second caliph, to Bayt al-Muqaddas, was to sign a peace deal with Christians and Ka'b accompanied him. Ka'b al-Aḥbār died during 'Uthmān's caliphate in the year 32 or 33 A.H in the town of Ḥimṣ.[6] This is while a tomb with a high dome was built for him in Egypt. Ka'b al-Aḥbār was a trusted and reliable

---

[1]. Ibid. vol.XI, p.111; Lisān al-mīzān, vol.II, p.408; Nathr al-durr, vol.I, p.207; Gharīb al-ḥadith, vol.IV, pp.48-49; Sunan al-Dārimī, vol.I, p.116; al-Muṣannaf, 'Abd al-Razzāq, vol.VI, pp.112-113; Madjma' al-zawā'id, vol.I, pp.172-173; Taqyīd al-'ilm, p.52(in the footnote), Djāmi' al-bayān al-'ilm, vol.II, p.42; Usd al-ghāba, vol.IU, p.235; vol.III, p.126; Zamm al-Kalām, p.64

[2]. al-Muṣannaf, 'Abd al-Razzāq, vol.VI, p.113

[3]. al-Muṣannaf, 'Abd al-Razzāq, vol.VI, p.114; vol.XI, p.110

[4]. Tārikh al-madīnat al-munawwara, vol.I, p.66; al-Muntakhab Min Dhiyl al-mudhayyal, p.504, It is quoted from Ka'b al-Aḥbār sayting to Mu'āwiya, "'Umar al-Fārūq " is titled in Torah.

Mukhtaṣar Tārikh Dimashq, vol.XXI, P.186

[5]. About his life, Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā, vol.VII, pp.446-447; Tahdhīb al-kamāl, vol.XXIV, p.193; Ḥilyat al-awlīyā', vol.VI, p.45; Mukhtaṣar Tārikh Dimashq, vol.XXI, pp.181-182; Siyar 'A'lām al-nubalā', vol.III, p.489

[6]. Aḍwā' 'ala l-sunna al-muḥammadiyya, p.148, footnoteIII

source for centuries and his quotations have filled books of history and interpretation.[1] But currently, given the new researches carried out, the image of Ka'b al-Aḥbār has been shrouded in mystery and has made decision-making difficult for Sunnites scholars and religious men.

Ka'b al-Aḥbār, on the one hand, received the second caliph's attention and on the other, is an important source for texts known as Israelite in the Islamic culture. These are quotations about the Torah and other Jewish scriptures that have a determining presence in Muslims' books of history, interpretation, Gnosticism and literature. Ka'b al-Aḥbār and Wahb Ibn Munabba are two main sources of the spread of Israelite in the Islamic culture. Since the anti-Israelite current gained force among Sunnis, the task of deciding about Ka'b has been made difficult.[2] We should not forget here that twice as much what Ka'b has quoted from earlier books, has been falsely attributed to him by others and he has been exaggerated.

Dhahabī says about him, "He had knowledge of Jewish books and had a special talent in recognizing false and true texts."[3] Here, the second caliph's trust in him, despite sufficient evidence, has not been trusted by those who did not believe the Israelites in general and Ka'b, in particular. Ibn Kathīr says Ka'b al-Aḥbār was the best of them (Muslim-turned Jews) who are quoted. He embraced Islam at the time of 'Umar and quoted the people of the book. 'Umar approved some of his quotations because they were truthful.[4] Moreover, 'Umar tried to absorb him. Afterwards, the people quoted many things from him in so far as there were exaggerations and he, too, quoted much falsehood while some of his words were true. Ibn Kathīr has implicitly admitted that 'Umar helped Ka'b find a place among the people who turned to him. Due to the cultural power of the people of the book, as soon as Ka'b arrived in Medina, people gathered around him and asked him to read them some news about the future events from the books of the predecessors.[5] What made people trust him was that he claimed his words were all based on "the Revealed Book of God". Here, book means the

---

[1]. More than others, Abū Na'īm Iṣfahānī has quoted one hundred pages from him under his biography section in Ḥilyat al-awlīyā', vol.V and VI

[2]. In recent times, Maḥmūd Abūriyya more than any other researcher has talked about negative role of Ka'b al-Aḥbār and the like on outbreak of the Israelites. Aḍwā' 'ala l-sunna al-muḥammadiyya, pp.145-194

[3]. Siyar 'A'lām al-nubalā', vol.II, p.490

[4]. al-Bidāya wa l-nihāya, vol.II, p.123

[5]. al-Futūḥ, vol.IV, pp.326-328; Biḥār al-anwār, vol.XXXXV, p.315

Torah about which Ka'b had told Qays Ibn Kharasha, "The Torah says there is no inch of land other than what happens on it until the Day of Judgment."[1]

Ka'b spread his words among the people by underlining that he was quoting from the "Book of God". Above all, the second caliph benefited from him and his knowledge. There are several instances to prove this. Hishām Kalbī says, "There was famine at the time of 'Umar. Ka'b al-Aḥbār told him, "When the same situation occurred for the Israelian tribe, they resorted to their prophet's Household and said the prayer for rain.

This advice led 'Umar to ask 'Abbās to say this prayer."[2] Another quotation says 'Umar asked Ka'b to talk about "death" for him. While Ka'b was elaborating on death, tears rolled down the caliph's cheeks.[3] In another case, 'Umar asked him, which of Adam's sons had offspring and he talked in this regard in detail.[4]

When 'Umar wanted to travel to Iraq, Ka'b told him, "Do not go to Iraq because the genies are there, as are their men and nine-tenth of sorcery, too."[5]

The quotation of Sayf Ibn 'Umar says that during the outbreak of plague, 'Umar called on his courtiers to guide him about different cities. Ka'b said the following about Iraq in response to 'Umar's seeking consultation.[6]

According to 'Abd Allāh Ibn Mas'ūd who met 'Umar with Ka'b, Ka'b said, "Allow me to tell you the sweetest thing which I have read in "The Books of Prophets". With 'Umar's approval, Ka'b al-Aḥbār quoted parts of the book which is more than a page.[7] 'Umar asked Ka'b to tell him about Ka'ba and he said, "God sent down to earth a hollow sapphire[8] and ..." In another occasion, Ka'b was sitting in the mosque when 'Umar entered and asked him to intimidate him and others.

He said, "O Ka'b! Frighten us!"[9]

---

[1]. Aḍwā' 'ala l-sunna al-muḥammadiyya, p.148; quoted from Tārikh al-ṭabarī, Biyhaqī as well as al-Istī'āb, vol.II, p.533; al-islām wa l-Ḥiḍāra al-'arabiyya, p.164

[2]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, al-djuz' al-thālith, p.7

[3]. Ḥilyat al-awlīyā', vol.VI, p.44 vol.V, p.365

[4]. al-Bad' wa l-tārīkh, vol.III, p.26

[5]. Ḥilyat al-awlīyā', vol.VI, p.23; al-Muṣannaf, 'Abd al-Razzāq, vol.XI, p.251

[6]. Tārikh al-ṭabarī, vol.IV, pp.59-60

[7]. Ḥilyat al-awlīyā', vol.V, p.391

[8]. Tārīkh makka, vol.I, p.40

[9]. Ḥilyat al-awlīyā', vol.V, pp.391, 381 and 371; Mukhtaṣar Tārīkh Dimashq, vol.XXI, p.185

'Umar said, "Prophet Muḥammad told me, "My greatest fear for my Umma is from the side of misleading Imām."

Ka'b said, "I swear by God that fear for the Umma is from no one other than them."[1] Another quotation says once at the time of 'Umar, Ka'b stood up and asked, "What was the last word of your Prophet?"

'Umar said, "Ask 'Alī."

And 'Alī answered, "While his blessed head was resting on my shoulder, he said, "Prayers, prayers."

Ka'b said, "This is the last oath of all prophets to which they have been obliged and ordained."[2]

Ka'b wanted to show himself well-versed in all books of prophets and in other cases, to make people accept what he said. Apparently later, some people noticed the problem that they could not rely on the distorted Torah. Therefore, how could they accept the words of Ka'b? To solve this issue, it was made up that Ka'b used a Torah which had not been distorted. In the final hours of his life, Ka'b ordered someone to throw that book of Torah into the sea. His justification was that he was afraid some people would use that book as a base for their reasoning. After narrating this story, Dhahabī says, "Now, this Torah is not in our hands and after that, we cannot rely on the existing book of Torah."[3] However at the same time, Ibn 'Abbās rejected the Torah as distorted and cautioned people against asking questions from the people of the book.[4]

Another narration says 'Umar had ordered someone to be lashed as punishment. When he was being lashed, he said, "Subḥān Allāh" or "Praise be to God". 'Umar told the executioner to stop the lashing. Ka'b al-Aḥbār burst into laughter.

'Umar said, "Why do you laugh?"

Ka'b answered, "I swear by God that Subḥān Allāh is a mitigation of divine punishment."[5] In another case, 'Umar and Ka'b were standing.

Ḥutay'a, the poet, recited a poem which said, "Someone who does a good deed, his reward will never be wasted because "the good deed" is ever lasting between God and his people."

Ka'b said, "By God that it says the same thing in the Torah."[6]

---

[1]. Mukhtaṣar Tārīkh Dimashq, vol.XXI, p.181; Ma'rifat al-ṣaḥāba, vol.I, p.233

[2]. Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā, vol.II, p.262

[3]. Siyar 'A'lām al-nubalā', vol.III, pp.393-394 quoted from Tārīkh Ibn Abi l-Khaythama

[4]. al-Muṣannaf, 'Abd al-Razzāq, vol.VI, pp.110 and 112

[5]. Ḥilyat al-awlīyā', vol.V, p.390

[6]. Ḥilyat al-awlīyā', vol.I, p.44; Al_Maḥāsin wa l-masāwī, vol.,I, p.123

Once, 'Umar asked Ka'b al-Aḥbār about different cities.

He said, "When God created the word and what is in it, Wisdom said, "I shall go to Iraq." Knowledge said, "I shall be with you." Wealth said, "I go to Damascus." Trouble said, "I am with you."[1]

In another occasion, Ka'b al-Aḥbār entered the court of 'Umar and sat down at some distance from him. 'Umar asked him why he had done so. Ka'b pointed to the wisdom of Luqmān and said, "One should not sit close to a person of power because someone else may enter the assembly who is more endeared; then, you will have to sit back a little. This way, you will be belittled."[2]

'Umar asked Ka'b, "How does knowledge leave the mind of someone who has learnt it?"

Ka'b responded, "Through greed and stretching one's hand out to the people."[3]

Once again, Ka'b told 'Umar, "Woe unto the "Sultan of the Earth" from the "Sultan of the Heaven"?"

'Umar said, "Unless for someone who checks himself."

Ka'b said, "I swear by God that this has been mentioned in the Torah exactly."[4] In another occasion, 'Umar asked Ka'b al-Aḥbār to tell him about virtue.[5] Once 'Umar told Ka'b who was seeking permission to go to Damascus, "Do not leave Medina which is the place of the Prophet's Ḥidjra and his city of burial." Ka'b said he had read in the Revealed Book of Allāh that Damascus was God's treasure upon the earth.[6] In another case, a verse

---

[1]. Mu'djam al-buldān, vol.,I, p.48; al-Muntaẓam, vol.VIII, P.70

[2]. Bahdjat al-madjālis, vol.I, p.48; Mukhtaṣar Tārikh Dimashq, vol.XXI, p.185; al-Djawhar al-nafīs fī siyāsa al-ri'īs, p.114

[3]. Bahdjat al-madjālis, vol.I, p.159

[4]. Bahdjat al-madjālis, ol.I, p.368; Ḥilyat al-awlīyā', vol.V, p.389; Tārikh al-khulafā', p.125

Ka'b's policy was that when 'Umar or Abū Hurayra or others spoke against his taste, he said, "The very word is cited in the Torah. He said about Abū Hurayra, "I have never seen anyone like Abū Hurayra who has not read the Torah but his words accord with it this much.

'Aḍwā' 'ala l-sunna al-muḥammadiyya, p.207 from Taḍkira al-ḥuffāẓ

[5]. Maqāmāt al-'Ulamā' bayn yaday al-khulafā' wa l-'Umarā', p.163

[6]. al-Muṣannaf, 'Abd al-Razzāq, vol.XI, p.251

Ka'b praised Damascus very much in front of Medina and Mecca. This is somewhat religiously and Jewishly rooted and is of a political motive to some extent for strengthening Mu'āwiya. They may have been later fabricated by the Umayya.

was discussed, كُلَّمَا نَضِجَتْ جُلُودُهُمْ بَدَّلْنَاهُمْ جُلُودًا غَيْرَهَا.[1] "Whatsoever their skin is fried, it is replaced with a new one to taste the pain."

Ka'b said, "I have an interpretation about this verse which dates back to the period before the advent of Islam."

'Umar said, "Say it, but we will confirm your words only when they conform to those of the Prophet (s)."

Ka'b said, "It means I will change their skin a hundred times each hour."

'Umar said, "I heard the same thing from the Prophet (s)!"[2]

In Bayt al-Muqaddas, 'Umar asked Ka'b about the location of the "Ṣakhra" and he talked in this regard in detail.[3]

Despite these examples, only Abū Zur'a Dimashqī has quoted 'Umar as telling Ka'b, "Quit the narration of "Ḥadīth al-Uwal")the first hadith(or I shall banish you to the land of apes!"[4] In another case, in continuation of a report from a follower of another religion talking about the traits of the caliphs in the Torah, 'Umar has been quoted as having cautioned people against quoting the people of the book.[5] Also, once 'Umar heard that someone in Kūfa had the book of Daniel. 'Umar called him to Medina and afterwards, that person agreed to burn whatever he had.[6] Such a position, even if existed, was not so firm towards Ka'b and the instances mentioned earlier, are proofs to our opinion. Once Ka'b came to 'Umar and asked permission to read the Torah. 'Umar answered, "If you know that this is the same Torah sent down by God upon Moses in Mount Sinai, then read it day and night."[7]

During these consultations, once 'Umar noticed that Ka'b had not given up his Jewish thoughts yet. In the year that 'Umar went to Bayt al-Muqaddas, Ka'b accompanied him. On this journey when there were talks with others including a monk,[8] 'Umar asked Ka'b to determine the place of

---

[1]. Nisā', p.56

[2]. Ḥilyat al-awliyā', vol.V, p.375

[3]. al-Bidāya wa l-nihāya, vol.VII, p.59

[4]. al-Bidāya wa l-nihāya vol.VIII, p.110, Mukhtaṣar Tārīkh Dimashq, vol.XXI, p.187

Abūriyya has said accordingly, "'Umar initially paid attention to his speech but later he found his weakness. 'Adwā', p.152-153. As mentioned in the context, there are plenty of examples showing 'Umar's giving him freedom of speech.

[5]. Tārīkh al-madīnat al-munawwara, vol.,III, p.1081

[6]. al-Muṣannaf, 'Abd al-Razzāq, vol.,VI, p.114

[7]. Gharīb al-ḥadīth, vol.IV, p.262; al-Fā'iq fī Gharīb al-ḥadīth, vol.I, p.651, إن كنت تعلم أن فيه التوراة التي أنزلها الله على موسى عليه السلام بطور سيناء فاقرأها آناء الليل والنهار

[8]. Ḥilyat al-awliyā', vol.VI, p.7

the mosque of Bayt al-Muqaddas. So, he asked Ka'b, "In your opinion, in which direction should we place the altar?"

Ka'b said, "Towards the Ṣakhra (Jewish Qibla)."

'Umar said, "You speak in favor of Jews! I also saw that upon entering the mosque, you took off your shoes."[1] However, even after that, Ka'b's position remained the same to the caliph.

One interesting point here is the claim of Ka'b al-Aḥbār and the people of the book about finding the name and characteristics of the second caliph in previous divine books. 'Abd Allāh Ibn Mas'ūd has been quoted as saying, "'Umar was riding a horse when it suddenly threw him off. At that moment, 'Umar's thigh was revealed. The people of Nadjrān who saw a black mole on his thigh said, "This is the same person who, our books say, drives us out of our homeland."[2] Later, Wahb Ibn Munabba claimed that 'Umar's description had been mentioned in the Torah.[3] Aqra' who was 'Umar's Mu'adhdhin, says, "The caliph sent me to fetch the bishop. I brought him so that he sat under the same shade with 'Umar.

'Umar asked the bishop, "Have you seen my name in your books?"

The bishop replied, "Yes."

'Umar inquired, "How?"

The bishop answered, "Like a horn!"

'Umar lifted his lash and said, "What is on my horn?"

The bishop said, "An iron horn, reliable and strong."

'Umar asked, "Who succeeds to caliphate after me?"

The bishop answered, "A righteous caliph who sacrifices his life for his relatives."

'Umar asked, "Who is next after him?"

The bishop said, "A righteous caliph who has drawn out his sword has shed blood!"[4] Although this narration is unknown, first of all, it is likely that

---

[1]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.III, al-Bidāya wa l-nihāya, vol.VII, pp.57 and 650, al-Manār al-munīf, pp.89-90; 'Aḍwā', pp.166-167. Once Ibn 'Abbās hearing Ka'b speak, اما تركت اليهودية؟ Al-Kāf al-shāf, p.139 quoted from, 'Aḍwā', p.165

[2]. Ma'rifat al-ṣaḥāba, vol.I, p.205(in its footnote); al-Mu'djam al-kabīr, vol.I, p.20; Madjma' al-zawā'id, vol.IX, p.61; Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā, vol.III, p.336

[3]. Ma'rifat al-ṣaḥāba, vol.I, p.213

[4]. Tārīkh al-madīnat al-munawwara, vol.III, p.1078-1079; Tārīkh al-khulafā', p.121

Someone who forged the news had a moderate belief towards 'Uthmān and 'Alī (a). In a similar quotation we read, 'Umar sent for Ka'b al-Aḥbār and he was asked, "How do find my attributes in Torah?"

Ḥilyat al-awlīyā', vol.VI, pp.25-26

its beginning part is correct and the bishop said these things only about 'Umar. Second, even despite being an entire fabrication, those people have been mentioned by other bishops and those familiar with the pre-Islamic books.

Ibn Shubba say s, "During 'Umar's journey to Damascus, an old man approached the army on the way and complained about heavy taxes. He asked to talk to the caliph.

Ṭalha asked him, "Have you found the news of the caliph's descent in your books?"

He said, "Yes, we know the descriptions of your chief and the one before him as well as your prophet." Then, he mentioned those traits one by one![1] Amālī Muḥammad Ibn Ḥabīb has been quoted as saying that Ibn 'Abbās said, "Towards the end of his caliphate, 'Umar wished death for himself.

One day when I was with him, he asked Ka'b al-Aḥbār, "I see my death close. First, what is your opinion about 'Alī Ibn Abī Ṭālib and second, what do you find in this regard in your books, because you believe that our affairs have been written in your books?"

Ka'b said, "In my opinion, 'Alī is not suitable for his job because he is a strictly religious man. He does not overlook any mistake, does not act to his Idjtihād and this way, he cannot control his subjects. But, what we find in our books is that the government does not fall to him or his sons."

'Umar said, "Then, who gets the rule?"

Ka'b al-Aḥbār said, "We find it so that after the believer in Sharī'a and two of his companions, the government will reach those people with whom the Prophet (s) has fought over the principle of religion,[2] that is the Umayya." Also in another occasion, someone from the people of the book came to 'Umar and said, " Oh, King of Arab, greetings upon you."

'Umar asked, "Has such a thing been mentioned in your books? Has it not been said that the "Prophet" comes, then the "caliph" and then "Amīr al-Mu'minīn"?"

---

[1]. Tārikh al-madīnat al-munawwara, vol.III, pp.1079-1080

[2]. Sharh nahdj al-balāgha, Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, vol.XII, pp.80-81; elsewhere it is quoted that the Jews came to 'Umar and said, "A verse has been called to you, if it were called to us, we would celebrate the day of call. The verse reads, ... الْيَوْمَ أَكْمَلْتُ لَكُمْ دِينَكُمْ I complemented your religion.

'Umar said, "Yes, I do remember that thr verse was sent on the day of "'Arafa"(9th of Dhī Ḥadidja) to the Prophet!!

al-Qand fi tārikh Samarqand, pp.434-435

He said, "Yes."[1] This quotation is evidently a mere lie. At the time of 'Uthmān, Ka'b al-Aḥbār responded to someone who had said in a poem that after 'Uthmān, 'Alī would come to power.

He said, "You are lying. The caliphate will go to Mu'āwiya."[2]

According to historians, Ka'b deviated from Imām 'Alī (a) and Imām, too, introduced him as a "Liar."[3] Ka'b said he had read the news of the cities' conquests in the Torah and that these conquests would take place at the hands of a righteous man.[4]

'Umar's familiarity with the people of the book, especially his friendship with Ka'b, caused him to sometimes say something or take an action by relying on what the people of the book said.

One of the companions says, "Prophet Muḥammad (s) had said the afternoon prayers. After that, a man stood up to say prayers. 'Umar grasped him by his clothes and said, "Sit down." The people of the book were lost because there was no rest between their prayers."[5] Also, the caliph's important decision in preventing the Prophet's hadiths from being written down was made under the influence of the people of the book.[6]

Zuhrī quotes 'Urwa Ibn Zubayr as saying, "'Umar decided to write down the hadiths and Sunna of the Prophet (s). He consulted the companions in this regard. They all agreed. 'Umar thought about the decision for a month and then said, "I have thought about it. I saw that before you, the people of the book had written books on the book of God and relied on them. As a result, they abandoned the book of God. But, I will not cover the book of God with anything else."[7]

Another quotation says 'Umar gathered what others had written and set them all on fire and said,أمنية كأمنية أهل الكتاب He aspires as people of the Book

---

[1]. al-Musannaf, Ibn Abī Shayba, vol.VII, p.529

[2]. Mukhtaṣar Tārikh Dimashq, vol.XXV, pp.24-25; Tārikh al-ṭabarī, vol.IV., p.434; al-Nizā' wa l-takhāṣum, p.78; Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.IV, p.495, No.1278; al-Bad' wa l-tārikh, vol.V, p.208; al-Kāmil wa l-tārikh, vol.III, p.123

[3]. Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, vol.I, p.77

[4]. al-Futūḥ, vol.I, p.228

[5]. Usd al-ghāba, vcol.V, p.199

[6]. Buḥūth ma'a ahl al-sunna wa l-salafiyya, p.97; al-Ṣaḥīḥ Min Sīra al-Nabī 'A'ẓam (s), vol.I, p.27

[7]. Taqyīd al-'ilm, p.50(in its footnote); Djāmi' al-bayān al-'ilm, vol.I, p.64; Kanz al-'Ummāl, vol.V, p.239; Dham al-kalām, p.63; in another manner in, Taqyīd al-'ilm, p.51; Tadkira al-ḥuffāẓ, vol.I, p.5; Kanz al-'Ummāl, vol.I, p.174

do.[1] And in another quotation, مثناة كمثناة أهل الكتاب his deviation resembles that of people's of the Book. [2]

At any rate, despite the Prophet's clear ban on reading the works of the people of the book – obvious example of which was addressed to 'Umar, himself[3] – unfortunately some people freely spread these ideas. It is interesting that besides spreading these thoughts, the writing and narration of the hadiths was prevented.[4] In order to complete this plan one side of which was the permission for spreading Jewish thoughts and the other one was blocking the narration of the hadith, a hadith was narrated, or in better words, was fabricated which quoted Prophet Muḥammad as saying, "Do not write any of my words and instead, narrate anything you want from the people of Israel."[5] This is while people such as Ibn 'Abbās and Ibn Mas'ūd openly voiced concern over the accessibility of the works of the people of the book for Muslims and rejected them.[6]

One of the phenomena which was created in this period and whose origin should be considered as a consequence of the spread of the Israelite, was story telling. Certain people known as "Qāṣ", the story- tellers quoted the historical-religious stories of Jews and used them as the interpretation of the historical verses of the Qur'ān. Their main source for these stories was the Torah and the verbal quotations common among Jewish and Christian scribes. These people made speeches for the people before and after the public prayers. This phenomenon did not exist at the time of the Prophet (s) and Abū Bakr, but became common at the time of the second caliph, with his permission and continued later on. The phenomenon of story-telling raised positive and negative reactions among the companions (Ṣaḥāba) and the followers (Tābi'īn) which we have elaborated on in a special book.[7] What is concerned here is that for the first time, Tamīm al-Dārī began story-

---

[1]. Taqyīd al-'ilm, p.52

[2]. Harawī says, " One of the people of the book was asked about the meaning of "Mathnāt". He said, "The Jewish scribes made up a book, after Moses, and called it "Mathnāt".

Gharīb al-ḥadīth, vol.IV, p.282

[3]. Gharīb al-ḥadīth, vol.IV, pp.48-49; vol.III, pp.28-29

[4]. Abū Hurayra says, "As long as 'Umar lived, we never dared say, قال رسول الله The Prophet(s) said, al-Bidāya wa'l-nihāya, vol.VIII, p.110

[5]. Taqyīd al-'ilm, p.31 لا تكتبوا عني شيئاً الا القرآن... وحدثوا عن بني اسرائيل ولا حرج Quote me just about Quran and unworriedly speak about Banū Isrā'īl

[6]. Gharīb al-ḥadīth, vol.IV, p.48; 'Abd al-Razzāq, al-Muṣannaf, vol.VI, pp.110,112

[7].Pazhūhishī darbāriyi naqshih dīnī wa Idjtimā'ī qiṣṣI khānān dar tārikh Islam, Qum, 1991

telling with the permission of the second caliph.[1] 'Umar allowed him to preach through story-telling before the Friday prayers sermons. Later, 'Uthmān allowed him to do so twice a week.[2] Tamīm al-Dārī was a Christian-turned-Muslim and many stories have been narrated about his virtue. This became the basis of a kind of Christian-style piety later greatly spread in the Islamic society.

Examples of these pious people who constantly quoted news from Jews and Christian monks, are abundant in the book of "Ḥilīyat al-Awlīya" by Abū Na'īm Iṣfahānī. It has been said that Tamīm al-Dārī had learnt his stories in the synagogues of Damascus and from the preachers of that land.[3] Also, another person named 'Ubayd Ibn 'Umayr was permitted to tell stories at the time of 'Umar.[4] We will see later that Imām 'Alī (a) was seriously opposed to story-telling.

'UMAR'S MURDER

According to some quotations, especially what has been narrated by Ṭabarī, some people have claimed that 'Umar was murdered with the plot of Ka'b al-Aḥbār. This news has been raised in different forms and it seems that anyone has changed it in a particular way. Historians and narrators of Sunnites hadiths brought this news in their books for centuries, but they believed so much in the predictions and reports of Ka'b and people like him that they did not have the least suspicion about Ka'b's role in the caliph's murder. Djāḥiẓ who is a rationalist critic, has this opinion about what Ka'b has narrated from the Torah (although there is no such thing in the Torah), I believe that many of these reports which have been quoted with phrases such as "We find them in the books" or "written in the Torah", have in fact been taken from the "Book of prophets" and works from the books of Solomon and Isaiah, the prophet. If the stories quoted from him about the characteristics of 'Umar, are from him (because he, himself, did not fabricate news), the problem cannot be solved unless with our justification.[5] Therefore, Djāḥiẓ Mu'tazilī, too, has not been able to have any doubts about Ka'b al-Aḥbār. At any rate, forecasting 'Umar's murder before the actual incident and the opinion that Ka'b had seen the news in previous books did

---

[1]. Musnad Aḥmad, vol.III. p.449; al-Quṣṣāṣ wa l-mudhakkirīn, p.22; Mukhtaṣar Tārīkh Dimashq, vol.V, p.321; Tārīkh al-madīnat al-munawwara, vol.I, p.186

[2]. al-Muṣannaf, 'Abd al-Razzāq, vol.III, p.219; Tārīkh al-madīnat al-munawwara, vol.I, p.11; al-Khiṭaṭ al-maqrīziyya, vol.II, p.253; Mukhtaṣar Tārīkh Dimashq, vol.V, p.321

[3]. al-Mufaṣṣal fī tārīkh al-'arab qabl al-islām, vol.VIII, p.378

[4]. al-Quṣṣāṣ wa l-mudhakkirīn, p.22

[5]. al-Ḥayawān, vol.IV, pp.202-203

not attract the attention of the Prophet's companions and other Muslims and it is only in recent years that something has been said in this regard.

In our opinion, there is doubt about the truthfulness of what has been said by Ka'b. What has led to the linking of this fabricated news to Ka'b was nothing but the interest of some simple-minded people in the point that the caliph's martyrdom has been mentioned in the Torah or other books, especially that the title of "martyr" has been particularly emphasized. Moreover, many stories have been quoted in different sources saying that others had reported on 'Umar's murder. Some of them have been collected by Ibn Sa'd and most of them have been related to "the invisible voice" or "genie". They said, for example, a voice could be heard reading a poem and saying the news but no one could be seen.[1] What has come in certain texts is that Ka'b had told the caliph before his murder that he had found him a just and martyred Imām in the Torah.

'Umar had said, "How will he be martyred in Medina?" [2]

After 'Umar received a deadly blow at the mosque, Ka'b came to him and said, "Didn't I tell you that you are a martyr?" [3]

If the news ended here, there would be no problem, but Ibn Sa'd has another quotation from Sa'd al-Djārī, 'Umar's freed slave, Umm Kulthūm told 'Umar, "Ka'b, the Jew, says, "'Umar is standing at one of the doors of hell." 'Umar sent for Ka'b. Ka'b came to him and said, "I swear by God that Dhi l-Ḥadjdja will not pass unless you are in heaven."

'Umar said, "How is it that once I am standing at the gate of hell and the other time, I'm in heaven?"

Ka'b said, "We have found in the Book of God that you are standing at the door of hell and do not let anyone in, but after you die, people will again go to hell!" [4]

We think what reveals the importance of the matter is a narration by Ibn Sa'd. He has quoted Ka'b as telling 'Umar, "In the tribe of Israel, there was a king who reminds us of you when we think of him. There was a prophet at the time of the king.

Once he told the king, "Write down your will. You will die three days later."

---

[1]. Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā, vol.III, pp.334-374, Tārīkh al-madinat al-munawwara, vol.III, pp.888-891

[2]. Ḥilyat al-awlīyā', vol.V, p.388, vol.VI, p.13; See the detailed form in, Tārīkh al-madīnat al-munawwara, vol.III, p.392; Tārīkh al-khulafā', p.133

[3]. Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā, vol.III, p.342; Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, vol.XII, p.191; al-Imāma wa l-siyāsa, vol.I, p.40

[4]. Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā, vol.III, p.322; Tārīkh al-khulafā', p.140; Ḥilyat al-awlīyā', vol.VI, p.23

The king said, "God! If you see that I am doing justice in my rule and obey you in the affairs, increase my life until my son grows up and my Umma increases in number."

God conveyed these words to his prophet and said, "I added fifteen years to his life."

After 'Umar was wounded, Ka'b told him, "If you ask, God will keep you alive."

The news reached 'Umar but 'Umar said, "God, take my life at a time when I am not blamed and disabled." [1]

In our opinion, this news has been distorted and it seems as if three days before 'Umar's murder (which in fact was three days before 'Umar's death and after his being wounded), Ka'b had told him, "You will die within three days, so ask God not to die." Interestingly, it has been said that Ka'b came on the second day and said, "One day is left." This news seems to be right.

Now, let's go to Ṭabarī's report which is the distorted form of the original news and has been quoted from Miswar Ibn Makhrama. He says, "After Abū Lu'lu''s negotiations with 'Umar over his taxes and 'Umar's request from him for building a mill, Abū Lu'lu' threatened him sarcastically.

The day after that, Ka'b al-Aḥbār went to the caliph and said, "Make your will; you will die three days from now."

'Umar asked, "Have you seen my name in the Torah?"

Ka'b said, "No, but I've seen your description and that your life has come to its end."

'Umar did not feel any pain.

The next day, Ka'b came and said, "One day of the three days has passed and two days remain." Again, Ka'b came the other day and said, "Two days are gone and one day and one day are left." The next morning, Abū Lu'lu' attacked 'Umar at the mosque and dealt six blows on him.[2]

The above news is evident in that Ka'b knew of 'Umar's murder beforehand, but when this news is compared with that of Ibn Sa'd, we realize that the story was such, Having adopted the news of the Israelian king and the prophet of his time, Ka'b came to 'Umar after he had been

---

[1]. Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā, vol.III, p.354; Tārīkh al-Khulafā', p.154

[2]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.IV, p.191; al-Kāmil fī l-tārīkh, vol.III, p.26; Nihāyat al-'irab, vol.XIX, p.374.

The same report is quoted by Ibn Shabba with a little difference. 'Abd al-'Azīz Ibn 'Umar Ibn 'Abd al-Raḥmān Ibn 'Awf

is the person commonly mentioned in Tārīkh al-ṭabarī's and Ibn Shabba's references.

Tārīkh al-madīnat al-munawwara, vol.III, p.891

wounded and told him that story from the Torah and the three days. Incidentally, 'Umar passed away on the third day after being injured. However later, the news underwent some changes to sound unnatural. This could have been intentional to gain some credit for the caliph by relying on Muslims' fascination with the divine news of the people of scriptures. The quotation that after 'Umar's injury, Ka'b had told him if he called on God to delay his death, He would do so[1], is a proof to the comparison made by Ka'b between 'Umar and the Israelian king. Out of his interests in the caliph, Ka'b advised him to ask God to delay his death so that he could live for fifteen more years.

As said earlier, despite the existence of quotations from Ṭabarī and others, historians did not have any suspicions about Ka'b al-Aḥbār. We believe that the true story was something else but the reason for the historian's belief in Ka'b was their real trust in him and the caliph's virtues. Meanwhile, some of the new Sunnites researchers who are influenced by anti-Israelism have ignored 'Umar's trust in Ka'b and have interpreted the above-mentioned news as a Jewish plot to murder 'Umar.[2] One of these writers has named Ka'b al-Aḥbār as the mastermind of 'Umar's murder, saying he had instigated Abū Lu'lu' to kill 'Umar. His sources are the news of Ṭabarī and the quotation mentioned by Ibn Athīr from Ṭabarī.[3]

About the caliph's murder, what has been clearly reported in history indicates that this issue was solely related to 'Umar and Abū Lu'lu' and the motive behind the act was, at least it appears so, that the murderer felt some injustice had been done to him and he had been overcharged. He complained to 'Umar in this regard. But, the caliph said that the money taken from him was not so much compared to his abilities and skills and naturally, his income. Some time later, the assassination occurred and it could be natural that the incident was totally related to the argument which had taken place earlier between the murderer and the caliph.

Mas'ūdī reports the incident as such, 'Umar did not allow non-Arabs to arrive in Medina.[4]

---

[1]. Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā, vol.III, p.361; 'Abd al-Razzāq, al-Muṣannaf, vol.X, p.225

[2]. It seems Abūriyya, before everyone else, has mentioned this thanks to Tārikh al-ṭabarī's reports. 'Aḍwā' 'ala l-sunna al-Muḥammadiyya, pp.153-155; Fi l-'ubūr al-ḥidārī "Ka'b al-Aḥbār", pp.200-204

[3]. Athar ahl al-kitāb fi l-fitan wa l-ḥurūb al-ahliyya, pp.237,240

[4]. According to sources, 'Umar never let mature Arabs enter Medina. As a matter of fact, the same man who was permitted to enter Medina, embraced on killing the caliph. Afterwards, 'Umar reproached those who agreed on entering of these people into Medina and called them his murder.

Mughīra wrote to him, "I have a servant who has been a painter, blacksmith and carpenter and can be useful for the people of Medina. If you agree, I shall send him to you." 'Umar agreed and Abū Lu'lu' came to Medina. Mughīra got two dhms from him per day. Once, Abū Lu'lu' went to 'Umar and complained about the heavy tax.

'Umar said, "What works do you do?"

Abū Lu'lu' explained his works as a painter, ironsmith and carpenter.

'Umar said, "Considering the jobs you do, your tax is not so much."

After a few days, 'Umar asked Abū Lu'lu' to build a windmill for him. Abū Lu'lu' said he would build such a windmill for 'Umar that all people would talk about it! 'Umar smelled threat from these words but said nothing. It was after this encounter that Abū Lu'lu' murdered 'Umar at dawn in a mosque. He injured twelve others six of whom died later. Then, he killed himself with a sword.[1] Mas'ūdī said Abū Lu'lu' was a Jew but some sources have termed him as a Christian.[2] This story shows that the murder was personally motivated.[3]

Abū Lu'lu' has been quoted as saying that apparently, after 'Umar did not respond to his protest, he said, "How is it that the caliph's justice covers everyone except me?"[4] Among his motives, one can also notice the point that Abū Lu'lu' wanted to take revenge in this way because Iranians felt defeated at the hands of Muslims. However, there is no proof for this claim.

There are several possibilities about who had incited Abū Lu'lu'. One is 'Ubayd Allāh, the son of 'Umar. Claiming that Hurmuzān was Abū Lu'lu' accomplice in the incident and he had seen them together the previous day, 'Ubayd Allāh killed Hurmuzān as well as Abū Lu'lu''s wife and daughter. He had no reason for this act and naturally, had to be killed as Qiṣāṣ, retaliation for the murder of three people for whose blood there was no supporter but the government. Even Ya'qubī says 'Umar had recommended

---

Tārīkh al-madīnat al-munawwara, vol.II, pp.889,903,904; al-Nihāya fī Gharīb al-ḥadīth, vol.III, p.286.

Those disagreeing with him said that Medina would be renewed just because of entry of the 'Alwadj.

[1]. Murūdj al-dhahab, vol.II, pp.320-321; Tārīkh al-madīnat al-munawwara, vol.II, p.888; Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā, vol.III, p.345; Ibn Djūzī, Manāqib 'Umar, p.210

[2]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.III, p.190

[3]. Therefore, it seems unjust for any sect to defend him, although some traditionally knew him a Muslim, believing that his murder arises from religious differences. al-Bad' wa l-tārīkh, vol.V, p.194

[4]. Ḥayat al-ḥayawān, vol.I, p.51

that 'Ubayd Allāh receive the Qiṣāṣ![1] But 'Uthmān did not agree and said, "People will say, yesterday they killed the father and today, the son.[2]

The second guess coming from the caliph, himself, was that maybe some of the Muhādjirūn were involved in the murder. So, he sent Ibn 'Abbās to them and asked, أعن ملأ منكم؟ "Did you order my murder?" And they said, معاذ الله! ما علمنا وما اطلعنا[3] "God forbid! We did not know and were not aware of it."

The date of the caliph's passing has been reported as the 26th or 27th of Dhi l-Ḥadjdja in the year 23 A.H whereas, he was only 55 years old.[4] Although elsewhere, Mu'āwiya! has been quoted as saying that he was 63 years old.[5] This forging may have been done to show that he died at the same age of Prophet Muḥammad (s).

In his last days when he had been wounded, 'Umar seemed not be so satisfied with his worldly life. He repeatedly said, يا ليتني لم أك شيئاً، ليت لم تلدني أمي، ليتني كنت نسياً، يا ليتني كنت حائكاً اعيش من عمل يدي[6] "I wish I were nothing. I wish my mother had not given birth to me. I wish I had been forsaken. I wish I were a weaver and would earn my own living."

CONTINUED CONQUESTS IN DAMASCUS AND EGYPT

After conquering Damascus, the conquests continued in Damascus. The consecutive victories of Muslim Arabs forced many cities to ask for peace beforehand as they could gain more concessions. The city of Ba'labakk was peacefully conquered in the year 15th A.H. After that, in the month of Rabī' al-Thānī the same year, the city of Ḥimṣ which was considered one of the biggest cities of Damascus, was invaded by Muslims. According to Balādhurī, the people of Ḥimṣ who witnessed the escape of Heraclitos from their city and were aware of the repeated victories of Muslims and their patience and perseverance, took refuge inside the city after a brief encounter outside the town and called for mercy from Muslims. In the peace deal concluded, in addition to guarantees for their life and properties, it was

---

[1]. Tarīkh al-ya'qūbī, vol.II, p.161

[2]. Tārīkh Guzīdih, p.186

[3]. Tārīkh Guzīdih, p.184; Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā, vol.III, p.348; 'Abd al-Razzāq, al-Muṣannaf, vol.VI, p.52; Tārīkh al-madīnat al-munawwara, vol.II, p.904

[4]. Ibn Qutayba, al-Ma'ārif, p.183; For other sources, Ma'rifat al-ṣaḥāba, vol.I, from 194 on.

[5]. Tārīkh khalīfat Ibn khayyaṭ, p.53

[6]. al-zuhd wa l-raqā'iq, pp.79-80,145,146; Bahdjat al-madjālis, vol.II, p.399; Ḥayāt al-ṣaḥaba, vol.II, p.115; Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā, vol.III, pp.360-361; Tārīkh al-madīnat al-munawwara, vol.II, p.920; Shiykh Mufīd, al-Amālī, p.50

agreed that the city wall and churches would remain intact. Only a quarter of the Johannes church was excluded for the construction of a mosque. Muslims, too, settled down in deserted areas and in houses abandoned by their owners.[1]

At that time, Abū 'Ubayda divided the governorship of different regions among army commanders. Yazīd Abī Sufyān was chosen for ruling Damascus, Shuraḥbīl Ibn Ḥasana for Jordan, 'Amr Ibn 'Āṣ for Palestine and 'Ubayda Ibn Ṣāmit for Ḥimṣ. Abū 'Ubayda, himself, set off towards Ḥumāt and Shayzar for expanding the conquests. Heraclitos who had now lost key centers in Damascus, once again tried to organize a huge army of Romans, Damascus people, the people of Ḥidjāz and Armenians besides the Arab tribes of Djudhām, Lakhm and others to fight Muslims. In historical sources, these tribes have been named as "al-Musta'raba".[2] This big war took place at the Yarmūk region which was the name of a river. Muslims are said to have numbered at 24000 and the Roman army and its allies at 200000. But, one should not forget that Heraclitos did a last-ditch effort to keep Damascus. This war was so tough for Muslims that even Muslim women had to fight.[3]

The Yarmūk battle ended in Muslims' victory and following his defeat, Heraclitos left for Constantinople. In this war, Djabala Ibn 'Ayham commanded the frontline army of Rome. There are different stories in various sources about whether he had converted to Islam or not, why he had taken offence from 'Umar and why 'Umar had repented from his treatment of him.[4]

One year after the Yarmūk battle, Muslims succeeded in surrounding Bayt al-Muqaddas. Abū 'Ubayda first invited them to either accept Islam or pay Djazīyya (poll tax paid in lieu of conversion to Islam). But, when they refused, they had to lay a siege on the city. The Nazarene community of the city, who found the situation critical, gave in to a compromise, provided that the caliph would come to al-Quds and sign the contract personally.[5] 'Umar was doubtful about going to Quds. So, he consulted some of the Companions. 'Uthmān was opposed to the idea, but in the presence of Imām 'Alī (a), he encouraged 'Umar to go, saying it was to the benefit of Islam and Muslims. 'Umar accepted his idea. After appointing 'Uthmān as his

---

[1]. Futūḥ al-buldān, p.137

[2]. Ibid. p.140

[3]. Ibid. p.141

[4]. Ibid. p.141-142

[5]. al-Uns al-djalīl, vol.I, p.126

vicegerent in Medina, he headed for Quds.[1] He moved towards Damascus arguably in the year 16th or 17th A.H.[2]

A variety of agreements were mentioned in the peace accord 'Umar signed with Damascus's Nazarene community. They received assurances that their lives would be spared. They were also assured that no church would be damaged nor any swastika broken. One of the key conditions of the accord was that Muslims should not allow Jews to live in Quds, nor should there any obligation in faith. The residents of al-Quds also pledged to pay toll like the people of Ctesiphon. Additionally, the Romans had to leave the city. The people were also free to move their belongings to Rome or anywhere else.[3] It was on this trip that 'Umar entered the mosque and inquired Ka'b al-Aḥbār about the site of the altar.

"The altar should be built towards the cliff which used to be the Qibla of Jews," said he.

'Umar was infuriated at the response, saying, "Your response resembles the words of Jews."[4]

Some time after the return of 'Umar from Damascus, a dreadful epidemic of plague dubbed "'Amwās" swept Damascus in 18 A.H. The plague claimed the lives of several Muslims including the top governor of Damascus. Chief among the victims were Abū 'Ubayda Ibn Djarrāḥ, Mu'ādh Ibn Djabal, Yazīd Ibn Abī Sufyān, Shuraḥbīl Ibn Ḥasana, Faḍl Ibn 'Abbās and Suhayl Ibn 'Amr. Yazīd died a few while after Abū 'Ubayda as he had replaced him. After his death, 'Umar appointed Mu'āwiya. Abū Sufyān, who had lost his eyesight at that time, appreciated 'Umar for visiting him.[5] In the last few years of 'Umar's caliphate, Mu'āwiya was the governor of the Greater Syria.[6]

One of the key towns conquered in the reign of Mu'āwiya was Caesarea. It was arguably conquered in 18 or 19 A.H.[7] The Arab troops were conquering further territories in the Greater Syria. In the meantime, the small towns accepted the peace treaty on their own. Many Arabs and Nazarenes adopted Islam.[8]

---

1. al-Uns al-djalīl. p.250

2. Futūḥ al-buldān, p.145 (some people have said that 'Umar traveled to Damascus four times during his caliphate.) Futūḥ Miṣr wa Akhbāruhā, p.56 (footnote)

3. al-Uns al-djalīl, vol.I, pp.253-254

4. Ibid. pp.256-257

5. Futūḥ al-buldān, p.146

6. Tārīkh khalīfat Ibn khayyaṭ, p.157

7. Futūḥ al-buldān, p.148

8. Ibid. p.151

When 'Umar was in Damascus, 'Amr Ibn 'Āṣ asked for his permission to expedite towards Egypt to conquer it. It is said that in the Dark Age, he had gone to Egypt for business. So, he was somewhat familiar with it.[1] 'Umar was afraid of launching such a bid. As a result of 'Amr's insistence and his efforts in playing down the risk of the attack, he eventually gave in. Amro, headed by a troop of between 3500 to 4000 men, headed for Egypt. It has been narrated that after the expedition of 'Amr, 'Umar withdrew his support and told 'Amr that if he had not yet entered Egypt, eh should return. However, 'Amr had entered Egypt. It seems 'Uthmān had accused 'Amr of expansionism, and had magnified the danger of the elimination of Arab troops before 'Umar.[2]

Egypt's governor whom Arabs called "Muqawqis" had been appointed by Romans to rule the country. He was Coptic. Hence, Prophet Muḥammad (s), in a letter to him, had called him the "Chief Coptic". The war between Muslims and the Muqawqis army lasted two years. In the meantime, Muslims conquered many areas and towns. The main reason behind the conquest of Egypt was the difference between Egyptian Coptics and Romans. So, the Coptics were not so willing to defend the Romans. Muqawqis, himself, was doubtful over this matter and waited to see what would happen. His brother, Benjamin, was the bishop of Alexandria. In the meantime, Cyrus, the envoy of the Roman emperor, had arrived in Egypt to reform the affairs. The stringent behavior further distanced the Coptics from the Romans.[3] The news of the consecutive conquests of the Arab troops in the Greater Syria encouraged further people to surrender.[4]

The prolonged conquest of Alexandria, which dragged on for four months, necessitated the dispatch of auxiliary forces to Egypt.[5] The town eventually fell to Muslims in 20 A.H. There is debate as to whether Egypt gave in through force or peace. The same doubt exists for many other towns. After the deployment of Muslims, they turned the town of Fusṭāṭ, which was their military base, to their administration center and left Alexandria. This was interesting from political and militarily viewpoints.

Among the troops of 'Amr Ibn 'Āṣ, there were some non-Arab fighters, some of whom were ethnic Romans and were called "Ḥamrā'". The other group was the Yemenī-based Persians, who had moved, along with the Arab tribes, to these regions. Following the conquest of Egypt, Iranians were

---

[1]. Futūḥ Miṣr wa Akhbāruhā, p.53

[2]. Futūḥ Miṣr wa Akhbāruhā, pp.57-58

[3]. Aṭlas tārīkh al-islām, p.133

[4]. One said to another, ان هؤلاء القوم لا يتوجهون الى أحد الا ظهروا عليه "These people declare war with no one but when they overcome" Futūḥ Miṣr wa Akhbāruhā, pp.59

[5]. Ibid. p.61

accommodated in a certain place. According to Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam, the mosque raised by Muslims at the site was famous until his age in the 3rd century A.H.[1]

A variety of matters have been mentioned over the reasons for the escalation of Arab conquests. The conquest of every region had certain reasons. The conquest of Iran, for instance, had a totally different reason from that of Damascus. These conquests were entirely achieved by Arab Muslims. So, it is evident that their will was the first reason for these conquests. This will stemmed, on the one hand, from their faith, and on the other from their leadership and the Muslims' administrative and legal systems over war booties. Islam allocated a large portion for the warriors and it was natural for the needy and the hungry Arabs to go the battlefield to earn something for their families, provided that they would emerge alive from the battlefield. As a matter of fact, Muslims had no concern whatsoever of being killed, because they saw martyrdom in the path of Allāh as a great achievement.

The staggering point about their will and determination was that Muslims had a high sense of self-confidence. Prophet Muḥammad (s) promised Muslims victory over the Roman Empire and Iran, saying, "The treasures of Caesar and Chosroe will fall to you". Therefore, Muslims moved towards the battlefield with an iron will and full confidence in the forecast of the Prophet. Initial gains made them stronger, livelier and more confident for later conquests. Another point is that the power of Muslims did no depend on a particular caliph, because a survey of these conquests from their start to the end of the first century A.H indicates that every caliph who had the chance of conquest, managed to capture several lands. The people's belief in the administration was a driving force of these conquests. No opposition was raised from the side of Medina rulers. The rulers under the caliph were totally obedient. It should be noted that the caliphs picked their appointees from among the people of the second generation of the Companions who were totally submissive to them. Yet, the significance of the conquests crated an atmosphere in which even potential opponents abandoned their dream of a political rebellion. Under these circumstances, the masses of troops pressed ahead with their conquests more comfortably.

The success of Arabs in Damascus had several reasons, one of which was that the majority of the Damascus residents were Arabs, and in spite of being Christians, they were racially linked to Ḥidjāz. Meantime, they maintained their distance from the Romans. In the early years of the conquests, some tribes including Lakhm and Djudhām joined Muslims, but when they found out that the war was serious, they fled to the nearby

---

[1]. Futūḥ Miṣr wa Akhbāruhā. p.129

villages and left Muslims alone.[1] According to Djabala Ibn 'Ayham, the relationship of the Anṣār, who originally came from the southern tribes, to him was, أنتم اخوتنا وبنو أبينا "You are our brethren and children of our fathers."

During the conquest of Qinnasrīn, the residents of the town hinted that they were also Arabs and did not want to fight against the conquerors. So, Khālid accepted their peace overture.[2] The Taghlab tribe, who had teamed up with the Romans and fought along with them, said in the 13th century A.H that they would fight along with their tribe.[3] There were, however, a number of other tribes who remained allied with the Romans till the end, and immigrated to the Roman territories after the conquest of the Greater Syria by Muslims. Apart from the Arab residents of Damascus disassociated themselves from the Romans, others including Jews, the Nibṭī community and the Egyptian Coptics, had the same situation. Faced with the mild dealing of Muslims, they felt they could live up with Muslims and see their rights met. As soon as Muslims captured Ḥimṣ, they found themselves involved elsewhere in the Yarmūk war. As they thought they might not emerge victorious out of the Yarmūk battle, they decided to return the money received from the people of Ḥimṣ to provide for their security. Faced with such a conduct, the people of Ḥimṣ said, "Your friendship and justice is more likeable to us than the oppression which we are living under. We will defend our town along with you."[4]

It has been said that the Nibṭis aggressively cooperated with Muslims, and as the Romans did not suspect them, they spied for Muslims.[5]

The other point is that the there were religious differences between Damascus and Rome. Considering the fact that the Romans did not treat these people properly from both economic and political viewpoints, the remarks of Will Durant will come true, "As the conqueror Arabs invaded Egypt and the Far East, half the people of those regions welcomed their arrival, because they viewed them as their liberator from the clutches of religious, political and economic oppression of the Byzantine capital."[6] At any rate, after the expansion of conquests, several towns followed the line of surrender.[7]

---

[1]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.III, p.570

[2]. Ibid. vol.III, p.601

[3]. Ibid. vol.III, p.464

[4]. Futūḥ al-buldān, p.143

[5]. al-Futūḥ, vol.I, pp.143-144

[6]. Tārīkh Tamaddun, vol.IV, p.64; al-Shām fī ṣadr al-islām, pp.63-64, footnote

[7]. See the list in, al-Shām fī ṣadr al-islām, pp.60-70

CONTINUED CONQUESTS IN IRAQ AND THE CONQUEST OF IRAN

'Umar's caliphate was accompanied with several conquests of Muslim troops in Syria, which started with the conquest of Damascus. In these circumstances, some measures had to be adopted in Iraq, firstly, to stabilize its situation in favor of Muslims and, secondly, to expand the conquests. In the meantime, the town of Ḥīra was freed from the Iranian control. Hence, Iranians were waiting for an opportunity to repel the new threat. Arab troops were led by Muthannā Ibn Ḥāritha. Yet, Medina's caliph, like the era of Abū Bakr, was determined to dispatch a commander from the known Saudi clans to Iraq. The nominee was Abū 'Ubayd Ibn Mas'ūd Thaqafī, the father of Mukhtār, from the Thaqafī clan, which used to be an ally of the Quraysh. Heading a 5000-strong troop[1], Abū 'Ubayd encouraged many tribes on his way to conduct Djihād and win booties. A large number of people joined him.[2] It was decided that Muthannā work under the command of Abū 'Ubayd. Iranians amassed a troop headed by Bahman Djādiwayh (Men of Shāh Ḥādjib) east of the Euphrates, whereas Abū 'Ubayd's forces lined up on the western side of the Euphrates. The Arabs crossed the bridge and launched the battle.

According to sources, despite the bravery of Muslims, the mammoth elephants existing in the Iranian army frightened the horses of Arab forces. As the Arabs had damaged the bridge, they had no way back. So, they sustained heavy losses and casualties. At any rate, a temporary bridge was built over the river and the Arabs lost out the war to Iran, which was dubbed "Yawm al-Djisr" or the Day of the Bridge, with a death toll of 4000 people.[3] Ibn A'tham, however, has narrated this event in a manner that it seems Muslims could defeat the Iranians and return to their army base.[4] Yet, the fact that the Iranians did not chase the Muslims indicates that they lacked the necessary readiness to do so. This even probably occurred in Sha'bān or Ramaḍān 13 A.H.[5]

Abū Mikhnaf and others say 'Umar was upset even until one year after the Djisr event. In the meantime, Muthannā Ibn Ḥāritha called the Arabs to

---

[1]. al-Futūḥ, vol.I, p.165

[2]. Futūḥ al-buldān, p.251; Akhbār al-ṭiwāl, p.113

[3]. Tārikh Irān, Cambridge (persian translation), vol.IV, p.15

[4]. al-Futūḥ, vol.I, p.170

[5]. Akhbār al-ṭiwāl, p.114; Aṭlas tārīkh al-islām, p.128. The author made a mistake about the fact that the king, in this time, regarded Iran as the city of Burāz, next, Shīriwayh and then Būrān. In essence, Yazdgard, since 632, succeeded them and conquering Iraq began from his time.

Djihād. 'Umar gradually thought of continuing the operation. Afterwards, around 700 people headed by Mikhnaf Ibn Sālim, thousands headed by 'Adī Ibn Ḥātim, and a number of people from the Banū Tamīm tribe joined the Arab troops in Iraq.[1] The Budjayla tribe also joined the Arab force, under the condition that one-fourth of the booties would be given to them.[2] The Arabs clashed with the 12000-strong Iranian troops, headed by Mihrān Ibn Mihrbandād (Mihrwayh Hamadānī)[3] at the Buwayb, a river branching out from the Euphrates River. Mihrān was killed in the battle and the Iranian army suffered a crushing defeat. Several Iranians were captured and Muslims earned large amounts of booties. Muthannā displayed noticeable bravery in the battle. The poems of 'Urwa Ibn Zayd al-khayl about the command of Muthannâ are notably exaggerating, "Among the commanders of Iraq, we have not seen anybody like Muthannā who belongs to al-Shaybān."[4] Some time after the event, Muthannā Ibn Ḥāritha died from the wounds he had sustained in the Djisr battle.

The battle occurred arguably in the 13th or 14th A.H. As 'Umar did not take any action for battle until a year later, this event should have not taken place sooner than 14 A.H. The victory boosted the morale and courage of Muslims and they constantly invaded the Iraqi lands which were still under the control of the Iranians. They also invaded a large market place set up near Baghdād. This issue indicated that Iran was not capable of providing the security of Iraq and had to think of a solution as soon as possible.

According to Dīnwarī, when Suwayd Ibn Quṭba (who had some power around Baṣra) heard the news of these wars from Muthannā Ibn Ḥāritha, he demanded 'Umar to strengthen the weak situation of southern Iraq and dispatch some forces to the region. 'Umar who seemingly did not have much trust in Suwayd to transfer the military command to him, sent a contingent of 1000 people, headed by 'Utba Ibn Ghazwān, to the region. 'Umar accompanied 'Utba out of Medina. Referring to the passage of Muslims forces from the Euphrates through Ḥīra to Ctesiphon, he told him to move towards Ahwāz and dissuade its residents from helping the Iranian army. 'Utba reached the place nowadays called Baṣra where there were only a number of ruined houses. It was the residence of Iranian border guards, who were commissioned with preventing the aggression of Bedouin Arabs.

---

[1]. Akhbār al-ṭiwāl, p.114

[2]. In time of war, Djarīr Ibn 'Abd Allāh Bidjilī promised his tribesmen that they would be the only Arabs to be benefited much in case this city were to be entered.

Akhbār al-ṭiwāl, p.115

[3]. Akhbār al-ṭiwāl, p.114; Ibn A'tham (Al-Futūḥ, vol.I, p.168) says that Mihrdād has been king of Ādharbāydjān.

[4]. Akhbār al-ṭiwāl, p.115

The first region attacked was Ubulla, on the outskirts of Baghdād. 'Utba wrote the news of this victory to the caliph, describing the town as a harbor of ships coming from 'Ummān, Baḥrayn, Fārs, India and China.[1] When the news of the victory reached Medina, the people asked 'Utba's envoy about the situation of the region. He told them about the amounts of gold and silver which Muslims had obtained. The news triggered an influx of Arabs towards the region.[2] Ubulla was located four leagues from Baṣra. It apparently existed until the 7th century A.H.[3] With the development of Baṣra, Ubulla lost its grandeur. Ubulla and other towns like Khurayba which was conquered shortly later, were said to be the concentration center of Iranian border guards.

Yāqūt says, "Baṣra was built beside an ancient Iranian city named Vahishtābād Ardishīr. This city was ruined in the attacks of Muthannā Ibn Ḥāritha, so when Muslims went to that region to build Baṣra, they called the city "Khurayba" (ruin).[4] Afterwards, Khurayba became a district of Baṣra.

According to Dīnwarī, the conquest and establishment of Baṣra took place before the Qādisiyya war. The fact that Baṣra was constructed before Kūfa indicates that 'Utba had reached southern Iraq before reaching Qādisiyya. Noting this issue, Yāqūt has mentioned that after reaching Qādisiyya, 'Utba moved to southern Iraq and to Baṣra.[5] What is important is that around 15 and 16 A.H, two war fronts were opened against Iran, one in Kūfa where some troops were advancing towards Ctesiphon, and the other in Baṣra from where the Arabs were moving to capture the southern Iranian lands in Khūzistān. The two fronts led to the establishment of the two important towns of Baṣra and Kūfa in Iraq, which later laid the cornerstone of the Islamic Iraq, in addition to Baghdād which was built in the 2nd century A.H. It is said Baṣra refers to a land which has black pebbles.[6] Quoting Ḥamza Iṣfahānī, Yāqūt says that according to Mūbadh Ibn Asawhasht, Baṣra is the Arabic form of "Bas Rāh", meaning so many roads, because several routed led to this town.[7]

After the conquest of Ubulla, 'Utba Ibn Ghazwān asked the caliph to set up a town for Arab immigrants. After studying the regional situation, 'Umar authorized the construction of the town. Thus, Baṣra was founded. After a

---

1. Akhbār al-ṭiwāl, p.116
2. Ibid. p.117
3. al-Ṭarīq Ila l-Madā'in, p.213
4. Mu'djam al-buldān, vol.II, p.363
5. Ibid. vol.I, p.432
6. Akhbār al-ṭiwāl, p.117
7. Mu'djam al-buldān, vol.I, p.430

while, 'Utba felt that Sa'd Ibn Abī Waqqāṣ was exceeding his limits in giving him unrelated orders. 'Utba, who considered himself an appointee of 'Umar, protested to Sa'd and left for Medina.

As soon as 'Umar heard the news, he asked, "Why is he not ready to accept the rule of a man from the Quraysh who has been a Ṣaḥābī, too?" 'Utba protested that he, too, was a ruler from the Quraysh and that Prophet Muḥammad (s) had said, مولى القوم منهم "Lord of people is from Ahl al-Bayt."

It seems that 'Umar had asked 'Utba him to return to Baṣra, but 'Utba died shortly.[1]

In an address to the people of Baṣra, 'Utba said in 17 A.H that, إنه لم تكن النبوة إلا تناسخها مُلك، فأعوذ بالله أن يُدركنا ذلك الزمان الذي يكون فيه السلطان مُلكاً "There is no prophethood not to have been rejected by a king. I seek refuge in that the Allāh from the day Sultan becomes the king."[2]

We said that the Buwayb event frightened the Iranians. This time, the Iranians mobilized a larger army led by Rustam Farrukhzād—the commander of Iranian forces in Ādharbāydjān—to prevent Arabs' invasion. Ibn A'tham has described the way Bahrām, the governor of Hamadān; Shīrzād, the governor of Qum and Kāshān; Banduwān, the provincial governor of Iṣfahān and Khurshīd, the governor of Riy, dispatched their forces to the battlefield.[3] In return, the caliph had to find a powerful commander for his troops. 'Umar initially thought he would travel to Iraq, but the Medina notables advised him against it. A number of people were nominated for the command, one of them Imām 'Alī (a). Advised by 'Umar, 'Uthmān talked with Imām 'Alī (a). Yet, Imām shunned accepting the responsibility. The next choice was Sa'd Ibn Abī Waqqāṣ who was suffering from a thigh injury.[4] He could not even mount on the horseback.[5] So, he did not attend the battle. The battle ever marked the worst defeat of the Iranians was called the "Qādisiyya war". Qādisiyya was the name of a small border town located amid the Ṭaff Desert, 50 miles from Kūfa. The town had a fortress and some palm groves and plantations. Around 4-6 miles from Qādisiyya, there was a resort named 'Udhayb which had a spring, and was virtually the end of the desert. Sa'd set up his camp at 'Udhayb, whereas Rustam camped outside Qādisiyya.[6]

---

[1]. Mu'djam al-buldān, vol.I, p.432

[2]. Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā, vol.VII, p.7

[3]. al-Futūḥ, vol.I, p.201

[4]. Murūdj al-dhahab, vol.II, p.310

[5]. Akhbār al-ṭiwāl, p.121

[6]. Tārikh Irān, Cambridge (persian translation), vol.IV, p.17

Wild conjectures have been given over the number of Iranian and Arab forces. Yet, it can be guessed that that the Arab forces numbered between 20 to 30 thousand[1] and the Iranians were between 3 to 4 thousand more. Meanwhile, Ibn A'tham has put the number of Arab forces at 60 thousand.[2] Rustam remained at Diyr A'war[3] for four months to settle the matter peacefully. Rustam tried to satisfy the Arabs, whom he thought, were fighting for food.[4] Additionally, the four months of stay at the camp could weaken the power of Arab forces. On the other hand, Muslims did not abandon their condition that the Iranians should accept Islam and pay toll or engage in war. Acceptance of the first two proposals of the Arabs was impossible, because Iran was a superpower. So, Rustam had to give in to war.

Ibn A'tham writes, "At the request of Yazdgard, Sa'd sent some envoys including Mughīra h to Ctesiphon to Yazdgard's court. As they entered the court, they sat on the ground except Mughīra h who sat by the king on his seat.

The king asked him, "What are these clothes? What are you wearing?"

Mughīrah replied, "It is Yemenī silk."

Yazdgard took this as bad omen and said in Persian, "Burdand Djahān rā," meaning "They plundered the world".[5] So, he ordered the start of the war. The Qādisiyya battle lasted only four days, with each day having a specific name. They were called Armāth, Aghwāth, 'Ammās and Qādisiyya.[6] The battle ended in favor of Arabs and Rustam was killed during the war. The Iranian forces withdrew as far as Diyr Ka'b where new forces under the command of Nukhāridjān helped them. Therefore, the Iranians refurbished their army and made a new onslaught. Dīnwarī says as Nukhāridjān entered the battlefield, he began crying out "any man, any man" to invite a contender.[7] Nukhāridjān was, however, killed by Zuhayr Ibn Sulaym (Mikhnaf Ibn Sulaym's brother). This time, too, the Iranians were defeated and withdrew as far as Ctesiphon. The Arabs achieved the

---

[1]. Akhbār al-ṭiwāl, p.119 (he mentions the forces to be twenty thousand people but he further refers to the troops joining him from Baṣra and other places.)

Al-Futūḥ, vol.I, p.175 (there, there is a census of tribal people)

[2]. al-Futūḥ, vol.I, p.201

[3]. Akhbār al-ṭiwāl, p.120

[4]. Ibid. pp.120-121 (This was exactly referred when Rostam spoke with Mughīra)

[5]. al-Futūḥ, vol.I, p.197 (Ibn A'tham mentions the exact speech of the king in Persian)

[6]. Ibn A'tham cites the names in a different way. al-Futūḥ, vol.I, p.20

[7]. Akhbār al-ṭiwāl, p.123 (Dīnwarī mentions his very calling "a man of challenge" in Persian.)

win very hard, because they suffered huge losses. It is said that a group of Iranians gathered around Iran's black flag, saying, "We will not abandon our place unless we are killed." and they did so.[1] The bravery of the Iranians made it difficult for the Arabs to defeat them. Abū Radjā' Fārsī quoted his grandfather, who had been in the Iranian army at the Qādisiyya war, as saying that the Arabs had to spray many arrows on the Iranians and the battle had become so tough for them.[2]

There are differences of opinion on the year of this war. Wāqidī has conceded that it took place in 16 A.H.[3] Armenian historian, Ilyās Nuṣaybīnī, has cited Djamādī al-Awwal 16 A.H as the date of the war. Meanwhile, Ibn Isḥāq has mentioned 15 A.H as the year of the war.[4] A researcher has said that the war occurred in the month of Sha'bān, 15 A.H.[5] During the war, the emblem of the Sassanids troops fell to Muslims;[6] an issue which indicates the crushing blow that the Iranian government suffered in the war.

In the aftermath of the war, Sa'd found out the necessity for establishing a town named "Dār al-Hidjra" for the tribes who had immigrated to the region from Ḥidjāz for war. Had Baṣra been established by then, it could have been a model for Kūfa. Yāqūt has cited ten reasons for the naming of Kūfa.[7] It is said that a number of places were surveyed. As the site was suitable for the raising of sheep, horses and camels, 'Umar preferred Kūfa[8], which was previously called Sūrastān.[9] After the site of the mosque and the palace of administration were determined, the nearby regions were divided between the northern and southern tribes.

The town initially seemed transient because the tribes set up their houses from reed. So, at times of Djihād, they removed the reed framework and ceded them to others. As they took their wives with themselves to the war, they had to build new quarters after their return. It was only at the time of Mughīra that people began to build clay structures. Yet, they did not build

---

[1]. Futūḥ al-buldān, p.259

[2]. Ibid. p.260

[3]. Tārikh al-ṭabarī, vol.III, p.590; Murūdj al-dhahab, vol.III, p.319

[4]. Tārīkh Irān, Cambridge (persian translation), vol.IV, p.17

[5]. al-Qādisiyya, pp.216-232

[6]. Murūdj al-dhahab, vol.III, p.319

[7]. Mu'djam al-buldān, vol.IV, pp.490-491

[8]. 'Umar wrote to Sa'd, Arabs resemble camels, wherever camels lay well, Arabs find it well too.

Futūḥ al-buldān, p.275

[9]. Futūḥ al-buldān, p.275

any rooms inside. Under the reign of Ziyād Ibn Abīh, brick houses became popular. Yāqūt writes that the caliph wrote to Sa'd, saying the mosque should have enough space to accommodate the participants in the war. So, it was built with a capacity of 40 thousand people.[1] Hence, Kūfa became one of the most important Islamic towns. At the same time, 'Umar sent a letter to the people of Kūfa, writing, "To the people of Kūfa, to the center of Islam." He also said of Kūfa that it was, إلى أهل الكوفة، إلى رأس الإسلام "To Kūfiyāns, to center of Islām." And saying about that, هم رمح الله وكنـــز الإيمان وجمجمة العرب "They are divine spear, treasure of faith and renowned among Arabs."

Salmān has also called Kūfa as the place "where there is Islam".[2]

After the Qādisiyya war, Muslims chased the Iranians and set up a military camp on the western rim of the Euphrates n front of Ctesiphon. According to Dīnwarī, they stayed there for 28 months, so long that they could eat dates of the palm trees twice![3] By that time, Muslims had dominated parts of Ctesiphon or Ctesiphon—meaning towns in Arabic. Ctesiphon consisted of seven nearby towns, protected by barracks. Entry into the greater town was possible through symmetrical gates designed around the city. On the Western side of the Tigris, were the cities of Bih Ardishīr (Arabic, Bihrasīr), Seleucids (Sulūkiyya), Darzīdjān, Sābāṭ and Māḥūzā while on the river's eastern side were the cities of Ctesiphon, Asbānbar and Rūmiyya which was called Wiya Andyū Khusraw. The king resided at Ctesiphon's white palace and the palace of Madā'in where the banquets and parties were held, was located in Asbānbar.[4]

Muslims captured the Western area after a brief clash and were stationed in Bihrasīr. The destruction of bridges by Iranians[5] kept Arabs behind the Tigris for a long time but they finally managed to cross the river and enter the town. When Iranians saw the Arabs, they cried out, "The devils came! The devils came!"[6] Kharihzād was initially supposed to stay in Madā'in as long as possible. However, when Arab crossed the Tigris and reached

---

[1]. Mu'djam al-buldān, vol.IV, p.491

[2]. Futūḥ al-buldān, p.287; al-Futūḥ, vol.I, p.288

[3]. Akhbār al-ṭiwāl, p.126; Futūḥ al-buldān, p.262

[4]. Tārikh Irān, Cambridge (persian translation), vol.IV, p.18. Yāqūt speaks of seven-fold cities of Madā'in this way, Isfābūr (Isfānbar), Wah Ardishīr (Bihrsīr), Hanbūshāfūr (Djundishābūr), Darznīdān (Darzīdjān), Wah Djundyū Khusruw (Rūmiyya), Nūnyāfādj and Kirdāfādh. (His mentioned names slightly differ from what has been quoted from Tārikh Irān.) He adds, Madā'in, in our time, is a village six leagues far from Baghdād. Citizens are mainly farmers and followers of Imām 'Alī (a). Salmān Fārsī's tombstone rests in eastern Medina. Mu'djam al-buldān, vol.V, p.75

[5]. al-Futūḥ, vol.I, p.212

[6]. Akhbār al-ṭiwāl, p.216; Futūḥ al-buldān, p.262

behind the city gates, fled from the town's eastern side and retreated towards western Iran.[1] The Arab's entry into the city was as a big victory for them. Now, the capital of the Sassanids kingdom had been conquered and numerous booties were available to Arabs. Among them, were things Arab had never seen until then. For instance, they poured camphor into their food, thinking it was salt![2]

Before that, Yazdgard had taken the royal family along with the treasures and other portable belongings and had fled to Qaṣr Shīrīn[3] in Iran's western mountains. From there, he went to the town of Ḥulwān near the present-day town of Sar Pul Dhahāb. Kharihzād, too, who had failed to keep Ctesiphon, set off in the same direction and settled in Djalūlā. In order to keep Ctesiphon, Arabs had no way but to chase this army. Therefore, Sa'd Ibn Abī Waqqāṣ sent an army led by Hāshim Ibn 'Utba to follow them. Iranians dug a ditch around them in Djalūlā, waiting for the arrival of backup forces from Yazdgard, Djibāl and Iṣfahān. But, Muslims did not wait for these forces and launched the offensive. In this battle, Ḥudjr Ibn 'Adī commanded the left wing of the army of Islam. Iranian forces were defeated in the war and had to retreat to Ḥulwān. After that, Yazdgard did not see it right to stay any longer in Ḥulwān, so he fled towards the region of Djibāl in Qum and Kāshān. A 4000-strong force of Muslim Arabs was tasked with protecting Iraq against the infiltration of Iranians in Djalūlā.[4] Now, Muslims were on the eastern side of the Tigris as well and were conquering those regions. Mihrūd and Khāniqayn were in that part. Finally, Muslims dominated all regions around the Tigris.[5]

Sa'd Ibn Abī Waqqāṣ was no longer interested in extending the war towards Ḥulwān and this annoyed some of his troops. So, he ordered an advance as far as Ḥulwān.[6] Then, he returned to Kūfa and ruled the city for more than three years until he was replaced with 'Ammār Ibn Yāsir. According to Ya'qubī, after conquering Ctesiphon, Sa'd came to Kūfa and the Djalūlā attack took place three years later in 19 A.H.[7] Balādhurī, too, has mentioned the same date[8], so it seems to be correct.

---

1. Akhbār al-ṭiwāl, p.127
2. Futūḥ al-buldān, p.263
3. al-Futūḥ, vol.I, p.278
4. Akhbār al-ṭiwāl, p.129
5. Futūḥ al-buldān, p.264
6. al-Futūḥ, vol.I, p.279-280
7. Tarīkh al-ya'qūbī, vol.II, p.151
8. Futūḥ al-buldān, p.265

Now, Muslims had entered Iran from three fronts, on one side, Ctesiphon was in their hands. On the other side, Abū Mūsā Ash'arī has come towards Ahwāz from Baṣra. And the third front which had opened by 'Alā' Ibn al-Ḥaḍramī in the beginning of 'Umar's rule in Baḥrayn and had achieved some success[1], now had initiated a new move and had made some penetrations in some parts of Fārs.[2]

Given the two latter fronts, Fārs which was one Iran's important regions, was now threatened by invasion. Hurmuzān asked Yazdgard to dispatch him to Khūzistān and Fārs for protecting those regions so that he could serve as a barrier on the way of Arabs' advance and even gather forces to help Yazdgard. Hurmuzān, along with an army, set off for Tustar (Shūshtar). The news of this army reached Muslims and they started a lot of activities to prepare troops. 'Ammār was tasked with joining Abū Mūsā along with half of the people of Kūfa. Before that, Nu'mān Ibn Muqarran and thousands of his men had joined Abū Mūsā. Even 3000 of the 4000-strong Arab border guards who had stayed in Djalūlā rushed to help. The army of Islam set off towards Tustar. At first, some clashes erupted outside the city and after 1600 Iranians were killed, Hurmuzān was forced to go inside the city and close the gates. There were also some martyrs on the side of Muslims. One of the well-known martyrs was Barā' Ibn Mālik. The city was besieged for some time until one of the city's nobles showed them a secret way to enter the city. 200 Muslims forces broke into the city from that way and after killing the guards, opened the gates on Muslims. The city was conquered and Hurmuzān took refuge in a palace. He only gave himself up after getting life assurance and under the condition that he would be sent to Medina to the caliph. 'Umar forgave him in Medina until after 'Umar's murder, hi son, 'Ubayd Allāh, killed Hurmuzān under the baseless pretext that he had been seen with 'Umar's murderer, Abū Lu'lu', the day before.

After the end of the war, 'Ammār returned to Kūfa and Abū Mūsā continued conquering other cities of Khūzistān such as Susa (Shūsh).[3]

At that time, Yazdgard was in Qum, according to Dīnwarī. He called on all people of Iran to assist him against Arabs who were getting closer every moment. People from Qūmis (Dāmghān), Ṭabaristān, Gurgān, Damāwand, Riy and Iṣfahān rushed to his help. They gathered a huge army and set off for war against Arab conquerors. 'Ammār wrote the news of this army to 'Umar who called on the people from the pulpit to head for Iraq. There, 'Uthmān asked 'Umar to send the Muslim army from Yemen and Damascus to Iraq. Moreover, he said the caliph, too, should go to Iraq. However, Imām

---

[1]. al-Bad' wa l-tārīkh, vol.V, p.183

[2]. Akhbār al-ṭiwāl, p.133

[3]. Akhbār al-ṭiwāl, pp.130-132

'Alī opposed this suggestion and said, "This will prompt the Romans to attack Damascus. Also, if Muslims soldiers from Yemen, there will be the threat of an assault from Abyssinia." Imām opposed the caliph's trip to Iraq because he said Iranians would fight with more fervor if they heard the Arab king's presence.[1]

At any rate, an army was prepared and its command was given to Nu'mān Ibn Muqarran, one of the Companions of Prophet Muḥammad (s). It was decided that if he were martyred, Ḥudhayfa Ibn Yamān, Djarīr Ibn 'Abd Allāh, Mughīra Ibn Shu'ba and Ash'ath Ibn Qays would replace him respectively. Two armies were stationed near Nahāwand. Nahāwand was located between two fronts of Arabs' war against Iranians, one from Ctesiphon and the other from Ahwāz. The two armies clashed with each other and fought intensely for four days, from Tuesday to Friday. On the last day, the confrontation was really heavy and despite the martyrdom of Nu'mān Ibn Muqarran, the Iranian army was defeated.[2] This victory was of great significance for Arabs, so it was named "Fath al-Futūḥ" (the victory of victories).[3] This battle probably occurred in the year 20 A.H. In this war, a number of Muslim Arabs including their commander was martyred. They were all buried in a graveyard remained in Nahāwand's history in memory of the battle's martyrs.

During the years 16 to 20 A.H, conquests continued in northern Iraq as well Muslims advanced as far as Mūṣil, bringing Iraq under their entire control. Among the conquered regions were the cities of Ḥarrān, Nuṣaybīn, Qirqīsiyā' and Samīsāṭ and many regions around the Euphrates and the Tigris.

ABOUT IRAN'S CONQUEST

The quick conquest of Iran and the fall of the Sassanids dynasty with all its grandeur was a surprising event that cannot be easily explained. Although similar events have occurred in Iran and other world countries and a comparative study of them can help further understanding of realities. In Iraq and Iran, many governments and dynasties, even the long-lived 'Abbāsids dynasty, collapsed at the hands of Mongol nomads. For instance, the Ṣafawids stable and firm for more than 200 years was overthrown by several thousand Ghalzāyī Afghans who had come at least 12000 kilometers to reach Iṣfahān. However, each of these developments must have its particular reasons. Here, it is suitable to quote a source about the political

---

[1]. Akhbār al-ṭiwāl, pp.134-135

[2]. Ibid. pp.136-137

[3]. al-Bad' wa l-tārikh, vol.V, p.182

situation of Iran's government after the defeat of Iranian forces against the Roman government in the year 428 A.D.

After Iran's defeat in the war against Rome, Khusraw Parvīz looking for scapegoats to blame them for his failure and among them, he decided to execute Shahrbarāz. But before he could carry out his intention, there was a rebellion and Khusraw was imprisoned and then murdered in late February, 628 A.D. Khusraw's son, Shīrwayh, ascended to the throne with the title of Kuwād II. He had joined the insurgents and had agreed with his father's murder. The new king immediately called for peace with Heraclius and accepted to recall the Sassanids armies from Egypt, Palestine, Syria, Asia Minor and western Mesopotamia and recognize the pre-war borders. It was also agreed that all prisoners of war be extradited and the Swastika and other emblems be returned. Both sides were happy with the end of the war operations which had worn out the two empires for several years. But, Shahrbarāz was dissatisfied over the establishment of peace and he was dangerous as he commanded a large army. Kuwād II passed away after less than a year in power possibly due to plague and his son, Ardishīr III, who was a little child, ascended to the throne. Shahrbarāz decided to claim the throne himself. So, in June of 629 A.D, backed by Heraclius, he went to Ctesiphon, defeated Ardishīr's forces and murdered him along with several of his prominent figures. Shahrbarāz sat on the throne, but his rule didn't last long and he, too, was murdered in less than two months. Also, another claimant in the eastern part of the empire who was Khusraw's nephew, was killed before he could come to the capital with the title of Khusraw III. As none of Khusraw's sons was left alive, the nobles named his daughter, Pūrān, as the ruler. Pūrān was the first woman to ascend to the throne, but she, too, passed away after less than a year in power. A group of kings took power one after the other and each stayed for only a few months. The only thing we know about them is their names as follows, Pūrān's sister, Ādharmīdukht; Pīrūz II, Hurmuz V and Khusraw IV. Finally, in the year 632 A.D, the nobles named Yazdgard III, the son of Shahriyār and the grandson of Khusraw II, who was almost the last survival of the Sassanids dynasty, to take the throne. Yazdgard lived in virtual hiding in the Iṣṭakhr of Fārs and it was there that the last Sassanids king was crowned in a fire temple which was named after the first Sassanids king.[1]

These developments occurred before the start of Iraq's conquest and naturally, they destroyed Iran's political and military structures. It is clear that Yazdgard needed years to put the situation of Iran, which was under domestic and foreign pressure, back on track. But, Arabs' assaults stripped him from such an opportunity and further dealt fatal blows on Iran. The

---

[1]. Tārīkh Irān, Cambridge (persian translation), vol.III, p.267

conquest of Iraq located near Ctesiphon, the Sassanids capital, was the first deadly incident which rang the alarm bell for the Sassanids rulers. Those consecutive blows disintegrated that hollow government and shattered it into pieces.

Despite the weakness of the Sassanids government, Iran's defeat cannot be entirely blamed on this incompetence. The Sassanids government did its best, as far as it could. From the Qādisiyya battle to Nahāwand's Fath al-Futūḥ, it tried hard to stop the advancing Arabs. Each time, massive troops were prepared, multiplying the Arabs, but the Iranians' bravery and courage could not resist the will of Arabs who were sure of their victory. The most important point was Arab's faith and their full confidence in the victory of their religion because spreading Islam was their main goal.

Spuler writes, "Today, there is no doubt that the religion of monotheism was the strongest driving force behind Arabs' conquest of lands."[1] We should also remember that while fighting for monotheism, Arabs expected booties, too, after victory. They headed for battlefronts after hearing Prophet Muḥammad's words who had promised them, the treasures of Caesar and Chosroe. When 'Umar wanted to provoke them, he said, أيها الناس! إن الله عز وجل وعد نبيه محمداً صلي الله عليه واله وسلم، أن يفتح عليه فارس والروم، والله لا يخلف وعده ولا يخذل جنده، فسارعوا رحمكم الله إلي جهاد أعدائكم من الفرس، فإنكم بالحجاز في غير دار مقام وقد وعدكم الله عز وجل كنوز كسرى وقيصر، والمواعيد من الله عز وجل مضمونة وأمر الله تعالي مفعول، والقول من رسول الله صلي الله عليه مقبول، وما لم يورثكموه الله عز وجل اليوم، يورثكموه غداً وانكم لن تغنموا حتي تغيروا ولن تستشهدوا حتي تقاتلوا.[2] "O people! The Almighty God certainly promised His Messenger, brought Iran and Rome under his conquest. He keeps His promise and never abandons His troops. God bless thee! Perform a Djihād with Iran's enemies knowing that Ḥidjāz is not a place to stay as He, the Exalted, promised thee riches of Chosroes and Caesaer and be aware that His promises are assured and His decrees are achieved. His Messenger's words are approved as well and what He leaves thee inherited today shall be inherited tomorrow too; thou never attain booties unless thou art changed and never do thou welcome martyrdom unless thou challenge the foes."

The tyranny and oppression of the Sassanids government was more or less effective in arousing the people's resentment or in other words, destroying their motivation for defending the Sassanids dynasty. It led to a reduction of military activities of the Iranian army in the battlefield. Apart from temporary collaboration which may be deemed as treason such as the cooperation of some nobles of Tustar[3] and Nahāwand[4] in showing the way

---

[1]. Tārikh Irān, vol.I, p.7

[2]. al-Futūḥ, vol.I, p.165

[3]. Akhbār al-ṭiwāl, p.131

[4]. Ibid. p.137

into the city, the joining of 4000 men from the Qādisiyya army to Arabs cannot be justified as treason.

Balādhurī writes, "4000 men (who were considered among the king's army) from Diylamān who were at the service of the Sassanids government, were in Qādisiyya with Rustam. When the Iranian army was defeated, they were standing at a corner. Feeling they had no shelter, they decided to embrace Islam. After that, they called on Muslims to let them live wherever they wished and to ally with any tribe they wanted. Sa'd accepted their demand. A chief was chosen for them who were called Ḥamrā' Diylam. Basically, Arabs called non-Arabs "Ḥamrā'", meaning having a white complexion. These people took part in the conquest of Ctesiphon and the Djalūlā battle.[1] There are other examples as well which show that right after Muslims' attacks, some peasants and farmers converted to Islam.[2]

Qazwīnī has written, "Treacherous and Arabized Iranians! From the provinces' officials and nearby border guards, threw themselves into the arms of Arabs as soon as they felt the Sassanids dynasty was shaky and the Iranian army had been defeated several times at the hands of the Arab troops. These Iranians not only helped Arabs in their conquests, but also called on Arab commanders to occupy other Iranian lands which were in their territory and had not been attacked by Arabs yet. They submitted the keys of castles and treasuries to Arabs provided that Arabs would let them stay in power in some regions."[3]

The late Djalāl Āl Aḥmad writes, "Before Islam came to confront us, we invited it. Let's forget about Rustam Farrukhzādī who desperately defended the Sassanids ferocity and the Zoroastrians' backward traditions. But, the people, Ctesiphon went into their alleys with bread and dates to welcome the Arabs who went to plunder the king's palace and the carpet of Bahāristān.[4]

The proper treatment of victorious Arabs with the people of the cities they conquered, could encourage the people towards the sincerity of Muslims. Peace accords did not force the people into abandoning their religion and traditions. Even there was no emphasis on destroying the fire temples. The tax paid was, in most cases, less than what was received by the Sassanids government and the provincial governors from the people. So, what reason could they have to sacrifice their lives for the Sassanids rulers. It has been said in this regard, "The peace accords of Arab armies with different town and cities, which in many cases, entailed much lighter obligations for the people compared to the taxes paid previously to the

---

[1]. Futūḥ al-buldān, p.279

[2]. Spuler, Tārikh Irān, vol.I, p.17

[3]. Bīst Maqālih Qazwīn quoted from, Khadamāt Mutaqābil Irān wa Islām, p.79

[4]. Gharbzadigī, p.48

central Sassanids government, urged many Iranian to give up. They were not interested in fighting for a court that did not pay any attention to them. We should welcome the new gods who take lower taxes instead of fighting against them. This was the psychology of many Iranians."[1]

[1]. Tārikh Irān, Cambridge (persian translation), vol.III, part.I, p.271

CHAPTER III
'UTHMĀN'S CALIPHATE

CALIPHATE COUNCIL AND 'UTHMĀN'S ELECTION

'Umar consulted with Prophet's (s) campanions in several cases while never compelling himself to fulfill their notions. It should be said when 'Umar had no idea in some cases, he benefited others'. In judicial issues, he preferred Imām 'Alī's idea tens of times. He consulted with campanions about Ḥidjra calendering and conceded Imām's opinion on determining "Prophet's Ḥidjra" as the beginning (era) of Islamic date.[1] Another example of consulting with Imām leading to his approved idea was about lands of Iraq.[2] The other one is about going out of Medina during the war with Iranians and defining a leader for Iranian troops.[3] In his suggesting to do some things, 'Umar cited favoring companions and consulting with them.[4]

Considering these counsellings, some have said that basically a consultative assembly was regularly taking place in a mosque and the political system during 'Umar's rule was a kind of democracy, even close to a republic.[5] This view fails to comply with the truth of that time and what history has reported. Occasional counsels are parted from parliaments that adopt the majority of votes and regularly interfere with the affairs. The source of Amīr 'Alī's utterance is what Qāḍī Abū Yūsuf [6] said as in the mosque there was the meeting of upper class among whom were the heads of tribes coming to Medina. He has named this group "people of Shuwrā." Mentioning Amīr 'Alī's inaccuracy in using words like "parliament," about the current meaning of this word, and Ibrāhīm Baydūn says, "There was

---

[1]. There is a disagreement on whether the Messenger (s) set Ḥidjra as the originating history or such an action has been taken in time of 'Umar. Seemingly, due to significance of Ḥidjra, Muslims had been using Ḥidjra as one origin in the very beginning years of it but this has been formalized in 'Umar's time.

[2]. Tārīkh al-ya'qūbī, vol.II, pp.151-152

[3]. Murūdj al-dhahab, vol.II, pp.309-310

[4]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.4, p.227

[5]. Mukhtaṣar Tārīkh al-'arab wa l-tamaddun al-islāmī, Amīr 'Alī, p.90

[6]. Kitāb al-kharādj, p.30

nothing called "parliament" as an established and influential board in the regime in that age." As 'Umar had a great influence in domestic and foreign political and all governmental affairs, this issue is more applicable in 'Umar's time. In fact, the afore-mentioned is the extension of the same thing in the Prophet's age.[1] It has been quoted from Imām Ṣādiq (a) that emigrants usually sat in the mosque and 'Umar confided the events in them, e.g. he asked them how to treat Magi (Madjūs), then "Prophet treated them as Muslims", 'Abd al-Raḥmān Ibn 'Awf said.[2]

As said, 'Umar also consulted with the companions about writing traditions and 'Alī, unlike their approval, refused to do so.

In caliph's opinion, another example of consultation is matter of caliphate. For the first time, he confessed the truth of Abū Bakr's election, in his speech in Medina he said that election was without consulting the Muslims, thereafter caliphate should be based on Muslims' consultation; if anyone swore allegiance to someone without consulting, both should be killed.[3] This speech led to the idea of one principle in choosing the caliph as outlined in this brief narrated phrase of caliph "al-Imāra Shuwrā".[4] What 'Umar said about the matter of succession shows that he himself was perplexed. In the beginning, he wished his old friends were alive to make them caliphs. One of them was Mu'adh Ibn Djabal.[5] The second person was Abū 'Ubayda Djarrāḥ, third, present emigrants in Saqīfa,[6] and the forth one Sālim Mawlā Ḥudhayfa who was not of Quraysh.[7] Surprisingly, despite all 'Umar's disagreements with Khālid Ibn Walīd,[8] he had been quoted saying, "If Khālid Ibn Walīd were alive, he would be my successor." [9] Thus, it

---

[1]. Min Dawlat 'Umar Ilā Dawlat 'Abd al-Malik, p.89-91

[2]. Tārīkh al-madīnat al-munawwara, vol.III, p.853; Futūḥ al-buldān, pp.266-267

[3]. Previously the sources of the quotation have been mentioned in detail. 'Abd al-Razzāq, al-Muṣannaf, vol.5, p.445; Fatḥ al-barī, vol.12, p.124; Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā, vol.III, p.344; Masā'il al-imāma, p.63; Tārīkh al-madīnat al-munawwara, vol.II, p.881; Mukhtaṣar Tārīkh Dimashq, vol.12, p.69; Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.4, p.227

[4]. 'Abd al-Razzāq, al-Muṣannaf, vol.5, p.446; vol.7, p.278; vol.10, p.103

[5]. Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā, vol.III, p.590; al-Imāma wa l-siyāsa, vol.I, p.42

[6]. al-Futūḥ, vol.II, p.16; al-Imāma wa l-siyāsa, vol.I, p.42; Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā, vol.III, p.412; Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.4, p.227

[7]. Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā, vol.III, p.343; al-Futūḥ, vol.II, p.86

[8]. When 'Umar came to power, he said, "I depose Khālid to make known if God helps his religion, Tārīkh khalīfat Ibn khayyaṭ, vol.I, p.106

[9]. Tārīkh al-madīnat al-munawwara, vol.II, p.887; al-Imāma wa l-siyāsa, vol.I, p.42

becomes obvious if one of these people were alive, it would not be a turn for Shuwrā.[1]

In fact, all of his candidates for caliphate had passed away. Thus, it was the turn for those alive.

"'Umar was with an Anṣārī (one campanion)," says 'Abd al-Raḥmān Qārī "when he got assured that the present people were confidant, he asked him about public opinion about his successor. He named some emigrants without mentioning 'Alī's. 'Umar objected and said, "Why not Ab al-Ḥasan? If he comes to power, he will lead people to the truth."[2]

Mughīra Ibn Shu'ba says, "'Umar asked me, who is qualified to be the successor?" I responded, "'Uthmān!"

He criticised 'Uthmān. I also named five people of the council, on each of whom he placed an imperfection and accused Imām of being witty."[3] Though he said, "If he comes to power, he will lead all to the Truth."[4]

'Umar asked Ka'b al-Aḥbār (who 'Umar believed was dealing with Scriptures)[5] about his successor, he replied, "'Alī is not qualified for it and as he had read in the books, those who have quarrelled with the prophet (s) over faith could be caliphs.[6] It seems that he had meant no one but the Umayyads and ahead of them 'Uthmān. 'Uthmān had a great influence during the ages of Abū Bakr and 'Umar.

"In your opinion, once he asked Ḥudhayfa, who was known as prophet's confidant, whom will people accept as the ruler after me?"

---

[1]. He explicitly interpreted that, "If Sālim had been alive, I would have not made Shuwrā responsible for the affairs; Tārikh Abī Zar'a al-dimashqī, vol.I, p.272; and he added, "If he had been alive, I would have never doubted his supremacy over the Prophet's companions; al-muqni' fi l-Imāma, p.59

[2]. 'Abd al-Razzāq, al-Muṣannaf, vol.5, p.446

[3]. Ibid. vol.5, pp.447-448; Tārikh al-madīnat al-munawwara, vol.II, p.880; al-Aḥkām al-sulṭāniyya, vol.12, Nathr al-durr, vol.II, p.49; Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.4, p.501, No.1291; Kitāb al-Futūḥ, vol.II, pp.85-86

[4]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.4, p.501, No.1290

[5]. See, Caliph's Thoughts.

[6]. Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, vol.XII, p.81; Gharīb al-ḥadīth, vol.III, p.239; al-Fā'iq fī Gharīb al-ḥadīth, vol.II, p.16; al-Futūḥ, vol.II, p.87; The Umayya meant that 'Uthmān was among them although he imself never fought with the Prophet over religion. Later on, Ka'b al-Aḥbār said Mu'āwīya basically possessed succession after 'Uthmān as if heavenly books reported this way. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.IV, p.495, No.1278

Ḥudhayfa replied, "I think people would leave themselves to 'Uthmān Ibn 'Affān."[1] Ḥudhayfa's perception was right because the Qurayshites were all 'Uthmān's advocates.

It should be mentioned that 'Umar was annoyed by the Hāshimites. The discussion between 'Umar and Ibn 'Abbās contains notable points.

'Umar, Ṭabarī writes, told Ibn 'Abbās, "Do you know why your tribe, (Quraysh) banned you from being prophet's successor?"

I answered "No."

Because they detested, 'Umar said, your caliphate and prophecy, then you would have so much vanity and glory. So Quraysh seized caliphate and it was the right thing to do.

"May I speak?" says Ibn 'Abbās.

'Umar said, "Yes."

I said, Ibn 'Abbās says, about what you say Quraysh seized the caliphate, I should say that if Quraysh had picked what God had chosen, it was on the right path without being involved in any denial and envy. But what you say about their reluctancy of prophecy and caliphate in one family, God has defined hideously such a tribe, ذَلِكَ بِأَنَّهُمْ كَرِهُوا مَا أَنزَلَ اللَّهُ فَأَحْبَطَ أَعْمَالَهُمْ. "Such they attested what God had sent, then their deeds faded away."

O, son of 'Abbās, 'Umar said, I've heard things about you I don't want to believe, if so, you'll be underrated.

If I'm saying the truth, Ibn 'Abbās replied, why my status would be underrated, and if you think it's credal error as wrong egoism he has kept away from himself. "I've heard you said they divested 'Alī of caliphate for (their) envy and oppression", 'Umar said.

As for oppression, replied Ibn 'Abbās, any ignorant and wise man knows, and as for envy, devil envied Adam, and we who are being envied, are his offsprings too. Also, said 'Umar, By God, O Hāshimites! Your hearts are filled with an indelible jealousy.

O 'Umar!, replied Ibn 'Abbās, don't charge the hearts, impurified by God, with having envy and alloy. Prophet (s)'s heart is of Hāshimites'.[2] Some time, it was him who refused to recruit Khālid Ibn Sa'īd because of his scruple objection with Abū Bakr's caliphate, it was obvious that he couldn't be contented with Imām 'Alī (a) who had sidestepped all this time and also, in the beginning, had withheld to swear allegiance for several months.

---

[1]. Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā, vol.III, p.333

[2]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.IV, p.223

However, 'Umar was demoralized in choosing his successor. When Ḥafṣa heard his father thinking of putting no one as the caliph, he told his father, "If you had a shepherd looking after your sheep and if he had left his duty, you would have regarded him as a waster, so considering people becomes worse."

'Umar said that if he did not put anyone as the caliph, he had treated like Prophet (s) and if he chose someone, then he had done like Abū Bakr[1] both seemed to him religious traditions. 'Umar stated that during his life he had been shouldering the responsibility which he wouldn't want to do so after death.[2] However, he couldn't leave the caliphate.

'Umar said, "Some people, according to Balādhurī, have said (and he himself accepted that) swearing allegiance to Abū Bakr was unbased and without cosultation. This would be done in "Shuwrā" after me.[3] 'Umar chose six people instead of one, putting the responsibility on 'Abd al-Raḥmān Ibn 'Awf[4] to consult with each other and choose one of themselves.

I found, 'Umar said, you are public headmen and this should be done by no one but you. Caliph, as said, placed an imperfection on each of them except Ibn 'Awf whom he praised.[5] 'Umar determined the council members as well as saying its quality of task. They were supposed to gather in a house where fifty companions guarded them till they would choose a caliph. It seemed that Ṭalḥa was not in Medina; (Balādhurī says this is true) if five people chose someone with whom one person disagreed, he had to be decapitated; if two of them disagreed with four people's decision, they had to be killed; if three people were on one side and three on the other side, they had to agree with 'Abd Allāh Ibn 'Umar's arbitration and if they didn't accept it, the group in which was 'Abd al-Raḥmān 'Awf, was preferred. And if the other three people disagreed with them, they had to be killed.[6] 'Abd Allāh Ibn 'Umar's role in this council of six people, had a consultative aspect, but he himself couldn't be as a candidate for caliphate because in his father's opinion, he couldn't even decide about divorcing his wife much less that.[7] Beyond all this, 'Umar had said this affair was for "people of Badr" as

---

[1]. 'Abd al-Razzāq, al-Muṣannaf, vol.V, pp.448-449; Ḥafṣa's reasoning is the simplest one in Shī'a for the necessity of succession by the Messenger (s). Others also with the same reasoning asked 'Umar to designate a successor, Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā, vol.III, p.343

[2]. al-Aḥkām al-sulṭāniyya, p.13; Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā, vol.III, p.342; Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.IV, p.501, No.1290

[3]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.IV, p.500, No.1288

[4]. Ibid. vol.IV, p.505, No.1303; Ḥayāt al-ṣaḥaba, vol.II, p.33

[5]. Ibid. vol.IV, p.229; Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, vol.I2, pp.258-259

[6]. al-Imāma wa l-siyāsa, vol.I, p.42; Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.IV, p.229; Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.V, p.504, No.1300,1301

[7] Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā, vol.III, p.343; Tarīkh al-ya'qūbī, vol.II, p.160. An imagination that is not so unbased is that 'Umar feared heriditary caliphate and he had this as a principle in his mind that ruler should not use his relatives in handling the affairs or assigning

long as one of them survives, after them came people of "Uḥud" as long as one of them survives. As for the released ones and their offsprings and the people who became Muslims in Mecca's conquest, they have no rights.[1] 'Amr Ibn 'Āṣ also tried hard to become a member of the Shuwrā.

But 'Umar told him he would not leave the task to someone who had fought against Prophet (s) [2] and he meant when 'Amr Ibn 'Āṣ was an infidel.

In the beginning, 'Abbās asked 'Alī (a) not to enter Shuwrā. But Imām said that first he was afraid of schism, second, what 'Umar had said, "Your tribe doesn't agree with the prophecy and caliphate in the same lineage", should be proved wrong.[3] When Shuwrā was shaped of members, Imām 'Alī (a)'s opinion was that 'Uthmān would be chosen.

Imām's analysis was that "'Uthmān and I are in this congress and we should obey the majority." Sa'd would not object to his cousin, 'Abd al-Raḥmān Ibn 'Awf (who both were of Banū Zuhra). Besides, 'Abd al-Raḥmān is 'Uthmān's brother-in-law and they wouldn't disagree with each other, so 'Abd al-Raḥmān would choose him;[4] therefore, if there are only two persons remained, that is Ṭalḥa and Zubayr staying with me, it is of no benefit because of Ibn 'Awf they would be preferred.[5] Moreover, since Prophet's time there was a pledge of brotherhood between 'Uthmān and 'Abd al-Raḥmān'Awf. [6]

'Abd al-Raḥmān announced that he favored not caliphate, others normally were not disposed to caliphate, Sa'd left the task to Ibn 'Awf, but he said that in his opinion, 'Alī was superior to 'Uthmān.[7] Thus, caliphate was exclusive to 'Alī (a) and 'Uthmān. Now, schism in society, Quraysh and non-Quraysh came to be real.

---

them as his successors. He mentioned this as an advice to 'Alī (a) and 'Uthmān adding, "If you became caliph, lest you might have the Hāshimites or family of Abī Mu'ayṭ dominate people, al-Imāma wa l-siyāsa, vol.I, p.43

[1]. Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā, vol.III, p.342

[2]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.IV, p.503, No.1295; Tārikh al-ṭabarī, vol.IV, p.230

[3]. Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, vol.I, p.189

[4]. Imām says in Nahdj al-balāgha, ومال الآخر لصهره Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha,, vol.I, p.184. After 'Abd al-Raḥmān payed allegiance to 'Uthmān, 'Alī (a) said, مال الرجل إلى صهره ونبذ دينه وراء ظهره "He tilted towards his kins and set religion aside" Al-Djamal, p.123; 'Uthmān's sister was Ibn 'Awf's wife merely on the part of his mother Umm Kulthūm, daughter of 'Uqba Ibn Abī Mu'ayṭ. Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd,Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, vol.I, p.189

[5]. Tārikh Tārikh al-ṭabarī, vol.IV, p.230; Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, vol.I, p.191; Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.V, p.505, No.1304

[6]. Tārikh al-madinat al-munawwara, vol.II, p.955

[7]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.IV, p.506, No.1308; Makḥūl Shāmī says, "Sa'd was not in Shuwrā because of his abdication. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.IV, p.507, No.1309

One should know that, here, Quraysh is "political Quraysh" which excludes the Hāshimites. According to Ṭabarī, 'Abd al-Raḥmān had been consulting several nights. All emirs, noblemen and people recommended him to choose 'Uthmān.[1] After three days, people gathered in a mosque in the morning. According to Zuhrī, 'Abd al-Raḥmān attended the meeting and Ibn 'Awf said that he had asked people and they had qualified no one but 'Uthmān.[2]

"Then 'Ammār Ibn Yāsir, Ṭabarī says, cried,"If you don't want "Muslims" to get involved in conflicts, choose 'Alī."

"He is right " Miqdād Ibn Aswad ratified.

"If you don't want, said 'Abd Allāh Ibn Sa'd Ibn Abī Sarḥ (whom the Prophet ostracized), Quraysh to come into conflict with each other, choose 'Uthmān." Ṭabarī adds that "the Umayyads" and " the Hāshimites" negotiated.[3] 'Ammār and Miqdād were on the Hashimithes' side.

"O, people!" 'Ammār said in the mosque, "God graced us by his Prophet and by his religion, He endeared us. Why do you divest it from his "Household"?"

A man of Banū Makhzūm (he was 'Abd Allāh Ibn Sa'd and was allied, in ignorance, with the Umayyads and Abu l- Djahl and Khālid Ibn Walīd were of them) replied, "O 'Ammār! You have stepped off your limits! How does the emirate of Quraysh relate to you?" [4]

Then 'Abd al-Raḥmān called 'Alī, "Do you swear, saying that, if you come to power, you would follow the Book, the biography of Prophet and Shiykhs!"

---

[1]. Tārīkh al-madīnat al-munawwara, vol.II, p.928; Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.IV, p.230; Zuhrī says, "That night Ibn 'Awf consulted the outstanding people of Muhādjir and Anṣār", al-Muṣannaf, vol.V, p.482. But we know even if he had consulted all of them, he would have observed only what Quraysh had said; 'Abd al-'Azīz, al-Dūrī says, "This supportive counselling of 'Uthmān indicates that the Umayya were active from conquest of Mecca on in achieving a landslide so far as all agreed on 'Uthmān's coming to power. Muqadama fi tārīkh Ṣadr al-islām, p.59

[2]. 'Abd al-Razzāq, al-Muṣannaf, vol.IV, p.477

[3]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.IV, p.233; Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, vol.I2, p.194

[4]. Tārīkh al-madīnat al-munawwara, vol. II, pp.929-930; Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.IV, p.233; According to Mufīd (al-Djamal, p.122), Miqdād shouted, "Do not swear allegiance to someone who was present in Badr, escaped Uḥud and was absent in Riḍwān alleginace (he meant 'Uthmān)"; 'Uthmān said, "By God, if I come to power, I'll return you to your previous conditions, al-Amālī, Shiykh Mufīd, pp.114-115

Amālī, Shiykh Mufīd, pp.114-115

"I hope I behave in the bounds of my knowledge and ability (Balādhurī, Idjtihād)", Imām said.[1] 'Abd al-Raḥmān called 'Uthmān and he accepted Ibn 'Awf's conditions. Thus, 'Abd al-Raḥmān chose 'Uthmān as the caliph and swore allegiance to him. "You chose 'Uthmān to return you to the caliphate", 'Alī (a) said.[2]

The evidence of Imām's speech was when 'Uthmān got sick, then he called his scribe to write a letter of allegiance for 'Abd al-Raḥmān's caliphate after him.[3] Later, 'Uthmān recuperated, the treaty dissolved and evoked hostility between Ibn 'Awf and him.

I haven't seen, Miqdād said, the Prophet (s)'s Household behaves like this after him. I wonder how "Quraysh" leaves a man whom I know no one wiser and more just. People look, 'Alī (a) said, at "Quraysh" and Quraysh does at his "lineage". If the Hāshimites comes to power, they would stay in power forever, but they can rotate caliphate in their lineage.

Ṭalḥa who came to Medina the same day asked, "Is Quraysh pleased with 'Uthmān? "

"Yes!" they replied. So he swore allegiance.

"You did the right thing to choose 'Uthmān", Mughīra Ibn Shu'ba told Ibn 'Awf. "We would not be consent if you were not elected", he told 'Uthmān.

'Abd al-Raḥmān accused him of lying.[4] Another account of Ṭabarī says about what Shuwrā members said in the mosque.

"We are the lineage of Nabuwwat, mine of theosophy, refuge of earth people and redemptive for those who seek salvation,"[1] Imām 'Alī (a) says.

---

[1]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.IV, pp.233,238; Tarīkh al-ya'qūbī, vol.II, p.162; Ya'qubī says, "In front of the condition of practising according to biography of Shiykhs, Imām said, "Following Book of God and tradition of the Messenger requires hiring of nobody; you're trying to make me overlook caliphate, Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.IV, p.508, No.1311; *al*-Bad' wa l-tārīkh, vol.V, p.192; Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, vol.I, p.188, vol.I2, pp.194,264. Zuhrī fails to mention anything about Imām 'Alī (a) and only suffices to say, "'Abd al-Raḥmān set this condition for 'Uthmān and he approved."; 'Abd al-Razzāq, al-Muṣannaf, vol.V, p.477

[2]. Tārīkh al-madīnat al-munawwara, vol.II, p.930; Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.IV, pp.233-234; al-'Iqd al-farīd, vol.III, p.76

[3]. Tārīkh al-madīnat al-munawwara, vol.II, pp.1028,1029; Mukhtaṣar Tārīkh Dimashq, vol.VII, p.254

[4]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.IV, pp.233-234,239; Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.IV, p.502, No.1294; and concerning Ṭalḥa, p.504, No.1300. Ṭalḥa was rewarded although he was ranked as the worst enemy of 'Uthmān in the course of his seige. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.IV, p.506, No.1306; Regarding position of Miqdād, Tarīkh al-ya'qūbī, vol.II, p.163; Tārīkh al-madīnat al-munawwara, vol.II, pp.930-931

Imām regarded Ibn 'Awf's deal in posing conduct of Shiykhs as a "deceit".[2] The narrator has considered that 'Amr Ibn 'Āṣ's had a hand in this craft but it's clear that it could not be done without Ibn 'Awf.

'Abbās believed Shuwrā is settled in a way that it would result in 'Uthmān's caliphate. Because of this, he asked 'Alī not to join Shuwrā.[3] According to Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, 'Umar asked the six people, "Is everyone favored in caliphate?"

Zubayr replied, "Yes. If you become a caliph, our rank and acquaintances would not be less than you in "Quraysh"."

Djāḥiz says, "If Zubayr was not certain of 'Umar's death, he wouldn't dare say it in front of him."[4] He further says, "Zubayr supported 'Alī[5] and because Ṭalḥa was of Banū Tamīm and Abū Bakr's causin, he was on the side of 'Uthmān who was against the Hāshimites."[6]

According to Ibn 'Abbās, 'Umar threatened Shuwrā members, saying that if they are at odds, Mu'āwiya would overcome them. He was then in Damascus.[7] After allegiance was sworn, Imām (a) returned home. However, 'Ammār said,

يا ناعي السلام قم فانعه قد مات عرف وأتى منكر[8]

'O thou who declare death of religion, rise up because goodness vanished and badness ruled."

Here, some points should be noted:

First, since then the Umayyads who were politicians of Quraysh, owned caliphate. This time, 'Uthmān represented them and they favored him a lot. It goes to say that, أحبك والرحمن حبّ قريش عثمان[9] "By the Merciful God, I like you as much as Quraysh liked 'Uthmān."

---

[1]. Kitāb al-Futūḥ, vol.II, pp.96-97; Tārikh al-ṭabarī, vol.IV, p.237, Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, vol.I2, p.195

[2]. Tārikh al-ṭabarī, vol.IV, pp.238-239; perhaps deceit ment the same quotation of Imām by Ya'qubī as Ibn 'Awf set the condition to keep him away from caliphate. Tarikh al-ya'qūbī, vol.II, p.162

[3]. Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, vol.I, p.189

[4]. Ibid. vol.I, p.185

[5]. Ibid. vol.I, p.187

[6]. Ibid. vol.I, pp.187-188; Nathr al-durr, vol.II, p.37

[7]. Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, vol.I, p.187

[8]. al-Bad' wa l-tārikh, vol.V, p.193

[9]. al-Ma'ārif, p.192

In contrast, Quraysh was hostile to 'Alī and it was 'Uthmān who told 'Alī, "It is not my fault that Quraysh dislikes you." [1] But this time, a noble branch of Quraysh came to power while it was not so during Abū Bakr and 'Uthmān. Although 'Umar was wealthy [2], he did not lead an aristocratic life. Yet, 'Uthmān was a nobleman with an Islamic past.[3] Then, the government gradually moved towards the aristocratic rulership of Quraysh and extremely used tribal norms overly in choosing the caliph.[4] It is said that at the very moment of election, Abū Sufyān told 'Uthmān, اجعل الأمر أمر الجاهلية, by which he meant to say, "Revive the customs of the pre-Islamic era." And he, of course, meant nothing but caliphate.[5] As mentioned earlier, being a member of Quraysh was not a constitutional prerequisite for caliphate and the tradition الأئمة من قريش had not yet become the basis of justify the rule of Quraysh, as it is not consistent with 'Umar's idea of making Sālim Mawlā Ḥudhayfa his successor, so he wished his survival and being a Qurayshite as an invalid condition, as 'Umar says, is what Shī'a since long has remained critical of. [6]

Second, Shuwrā and deliberation about caliphate came to be posed for the first time. This Shuwrā had two aspects, one was the six-member council framework of heads of Quraysh and the caliphate was in hands of no one but them. 'Umar had determined the rules of election and based it on the

---

[1]. Ma'rifat al-ṣaḥāba, vol.I, p.1301; this statement is attributed to 'Umar that 'Uthmān may probably be named rather than 'Umar, al-Muqanna', p.110; Manāqib, vol.III, p.220

[2]. Ḥayāt al-ṣaḥaba, vol.I, p.347,

Kashf al-astār, vol.II0, p.303; Tārikh al-madīnat al-munawwara, vol.II, p.935

[3]. Mukhtaṣar Tārīkh Dimashq, vol.I1, p.67

[4]. Muqadama fī tārīkh Ṣadr al-islām, pp.58-59

[5]. When 'Umar asked Ibn 'Abbās about 'Uthmān, he said, "He keeps love of this world and the world hereafter in his heart and if he comes to power, he'll have family of Abī Mu'ayṭ rule people; al-Īḍāḥ, p.86. In the very night of succession (beginning of Muḥarram, 24 H.), when 'Uthmān was on his way to the mosque to say night prayers, there were people ahead of him carrying candles and Miqdād said, "What innovation this is!" (Ya'qūbī, vol.II, p.163); he referred to starting point of ceremonial functions! Ibn A'tham quoted Ibn 'Awf as saying that, "I am pleased with the succession of the doyen of the Umayya."; al-Futūḥ, vol.II, p.909

[6]. al-Īḍāḥ, pp.127-128; as said, the condition of being a member of Quraysh was because of dominating nature of tribalism. 'Umar appointed Ṣuhayb Rūmī as congregational leader just for the three days Shuwrā is engaged in talks and said, "He is of Mawālī (freed slaves) and will not be in conflict with you over succession; al-Imāma wa l-siyāsa, vol.I, p.42

majority and the minority[1] and if equal, set the balance heavier on the part of three people among whom was Ibn 'Awf. Another is Ibn 'Awf's consultation with people lasting several nights according to what is said. Of course, Ibn 'Awf was blamed for choosing 'Uthmān because of his kinship and this consultation could cover it. Moreover, just like Abū Bakr and 'Umar, they had made a pledge of brotherhood. It should be noted that later there appeared a conflict between 'Uthmān and Ibn 'Awf and when Ibn 'Awf was badly thrashed by 'Uthmān's agents, he passed away while being discontented with 'Uthmān.[2] What is important is the role of Shuwrā. However, Shuwrā consisted of six chosen people and this number could resolve choosing one person out of six. This was a kind of limited Shuwrā among a few Quraysh elites, so no one could interfere save them. This effective method was seen, in the next periods, among some of Imām's opponents as well as among the Zubayrids who were against the Umayyads. This will be dealt with later.

The ***third*** point concerned was allegiance. After Ibn 'Awf and other Shuwrā members swore allegiance, 'Alī (a) still avoided doing so.

"Swear allegiance", Ibn 'Awf told him, "or I will decapitate you."

Imām left the house. Shuwrā companions followed him and said, بايع وإلّا جاهدناك "Swear an allegiance or we will Djihād with you."

Imām (a) followed them and swore an allegiance to 'Uthmān.[3] This is something that is criticized.[4]

"If you are a man of fighting, we will help you." Miqdād asked 'Alī (a).

Imām said, "Who will help me to fight them?"

'Ammār also said the same thing.[5]

---

[1]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.IV, p.503, No.1298 ليتّبع الأقل الاكثر فمن خالفكم فاضربوا عنقه The minority must follow the majority and whosoever opposes, he shall be dicapitated.

[2]. Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, vol.I, p.196; Tārīkh al-madīnat al-munawwara, vol.II, p.1033; 'Alī (a) is said to have cursed Ibn 'Awf when selecting 'Uthmān and Abū Hilāl 'Askarī says, "'Uthmān and Ibn 'Awf were in disagreement over fulfilment of 'Alī's invokation; Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, vol.XII, p.196

[3]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.IV, p.508, No.1311; Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, vol.IX, p.55; vol.I2, p.265; al-Bad' wa l-tārīkh, vol.V, p.193; Ḥabīb al-siyar, vol.I, p.496; Imām Himself expressed his statement that he has been told If he failed to swear allegiance, he would be fought. He also says, "I unwillingly pledged allegiance; al-Ghārāt, vol.I, p.318. However, fanatic narrators have said that 'Alī was the first one to swear allegiance after Ibn'Awf! Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā, vol.III, p.63

[4]. Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, vol.I2, p.259 (according to Sayyid Murtaḍā)

[5]. Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, vol.I2, pp.265-266; al-Amālī, Mufīd, p.115

This was based on what 'Umar had said, "If anyone refused to swear allegiance, he should be beheaded."

As mentioned before, 'Umar was one of those who believed in securing allegiance by force [1]- despite what is ascribed to Abū Bakr. 'Umar could not believe some people were trying for schism.

At first, when he appointed Shuwrā members, he said, "If you all choose one person and one of you disagrees with them, you could kill him."[2] Later, it remains to be seen that after Imām (a) came to power, he ceased to agree to secure allegiance by force from those who refused to do so.

The last point is that one of marginal effects of Shuwrā was the members caprice for caliphate. In 'Umar's opinion, they all had the privilege to seize caliphate and this aroused their expectations.

As said, "When you become a caliph", Zubayr told him at the presence of 'Umar. "we could also be caliphs because we are not lower in rank than you from the viewpoint of being a Quraysh and our precedence." [3] Normally, this Shuwrā would make them expect more. There was a reason why 'Amr Ibn 'Āṣ and Mughīra Ibn Shu'ba were trying to join this council. Such an expectation resulted in provoking next revolts and also objections against 'Uthmān and later against 'Alī (a).

Mu'āwiya's analysis was that since Ṭalḥa, Zubayr and Sa'd Ibn Abī Waqqāṣ supposed that they are eligible for caliphate, 'Umar's Shuwrā raised differences among Muslims.[4] Shiykh Mufīd also writes about Sa'd Ibn Abī Waqqāṣ, "Personally, he didn't identify himself equal to 'Alī (a) but as he joined Shuwrā, he came to this feeling that he has the authority of caliphate, and this ruined his faith and life."[5] Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd has quoted his professor's analysis that each of Shuwrā members, inside themselves, had this feeling that they were capable of caliphate.This preoccupied them till the next differences appeared.[6] In Djamal battle, Ṭalḥa told 'Alī (a), "Resign from caliphate, then we leave it to "Shuwrā"." "We were also in Shuwrā, two people who didn't want you, now have passed away, we are also three", he added.

---

[1]. al-Īḍāḥ, pp.187-188

[2]. al-Futūḥ, vol.II, p.91; Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā, vol.III, p.61

[3]. Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, vol.I, p.185; Abū Bakr said to 'Umar that he had to be careful of Muḥādjirūn because many of them were capricious of succession; Nathr al-durr, vol.II, pp.16,22

[4]. al-'Iqd al-farīd, vol.IV, p.281; Mukhtaṣar Tārīkh Dimashq, vol.IX, p.85

[5]. al-Djamal, p.97

[6]. Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, vol.IX, pp.28-29

"You should have said that before swearing an allegiance but now that you have swore, you should be faithful",[1] 'Alī replied.

'UTHMĀN'S CALIPHATE

'Uthmān was one of those Muslims who became a Muslim as called by Abū Bakr in the first years. He was one of the Umayyads and his Islam was strange in a family most of whom were anti-Islam people. He was one of those who migrated to Ethiopia, but soon he returned Mecca and migrated to Medina. There, he married two of the Prophet (s)'s daughters respectively who died soon. Because of his wife's sickness, 'Uthmān did not attend Badr. Also, in Uḥud he was with the fugitives who, indeed, were blessed. Later, there is no memory of him except in the issue of Ḥudaybīyya.[2]

In Abū Bakr's time, he was close to him and was his scribe. It was him who wrote 'Umar's allegiance – Abū Bakr said – while he was unconscious. Also, he had a great influence in 'Umar's time and was the Umayyads' envoy in that situation. Afterwards, 'Uthmān as Umayyads' envoy and Imām 'Alī (a) as the Hāshimites' seemed to be atop of those who will lead the society in the future. 'Umar had probably realized or practically had the inclination that 'Uthmān was more capable of leading an Islamic society because of his influence and Popularity in Quraysh. Whatever his opinion was, it can't be neglected that Quraysh wanted him. When he rather came in grips with Imām in the time of 'Uthmān's succession, he told Imām, ما ذنبي إن لم يحبك قريش "Is it my fault that Quraysh doesn't like you?"[3]

Ibn Qutayba also declares that 'Uthmān was favored by Quraysh, so it was said, أحبك والرحمن حب قريش عثمان[4] "By the Compassionate God, I love thee as Quraysh loved 'Uthmān."

As swearing allegiance to 'Uthmān ended in the last day of Dhi l-Ḥadjdja, 23 A.H., he sat on the Messenger's (s) rostrum. The difference between him and previous caliphs was that Abū Bakr sat one step down where the Prophet (s) used to sit, 'Umar one step down Abū Bakr and unlike them, 'Uthmān sat where Prophet sat.[5] WThen he mounted the rostrum, he

---

[1]. al-Imāma wa l-siyāsa, vol.I, p.95

[2]. See, issue of Ḥudaybiyya in Tārikh Siyāsī Islām, vol.I, "Biography of the Messenger (s)"

[3]. Ma'rifat al-ṣaḥāba, vol.I, p.301

[4]. al-Ma'ārif, p.192; Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.V, p.11

[5]. Tarīkh al-ya'qūbī, vol.II, p.163

couldn't speak. He thought a bit and then, "you need a just Imām more than a lecturer", he said. Then he came down the rostrum and went home.[1]

His first action was to overlook 'Ubayd Allāh Ibn 'Umar's punishment. He killed three people, Iranian Hurmuzān and Abū Lu'lu' 's family who were accused of murdering his father, 'Umar. 'Uthmān as the ruler dispensed with his Qiṣās, retaliation, and changed it to blood money and stood against protesters.[2] 'Uthmān's caliphate must be considered as the beginning of the Umayyads' caliphate. Ibn A'tham has named him "Doyen of the Umayyads" quoting from Ibn 'Awf.[3] The Umayyads thought of lordship since they were ignorant.

When people, Abū Bakr Djuwharī says, swore allegiance to 'Uthmān, "this", said Abū Sufyān, "was in Taym's hands (Abū Bakr's tribe) while it didn't concern them; thereafter, "'Adī" (tribe) took hold that was much farther." "Now it has returned to its reservation."

"Leave it hereditary among your offsprings, there is neither a heaven nor a hell", he told 'Uthmān and the Umayyads."[4]

According to Mas'ūdī, 'Ammār who had heard Abū Sufyān in the mosque, stood up and began to protest. Miqdād also did the same after him and said he was worried about turning Ahl al-Bayt from this affair.[5] Ibn 'Asākir has also narrated that Abū Sufyān told 'Uthmān, اجعل الأمر أمر الجاهلية[6] "Settle the case out of ignorance."

Of course, this evidence only specifies Abū Sufyān's idea not 'Uthmān's; however, 'Uthmān's caliphate is Abū Sufyān's hope for the throwback of the Umayyads' dominance. His caliphate begins with mightiness of Quraysh's nobleness. Therefore, it is said that he was more favored by Quraysh than 'Umar.[7] The strife of Muslim world after the Prophet (s) was indeed the conflict between the Islamic norms and tribal ones. Quraysh's victory was regarded as the triumph of tribal norms; however, in the time of the first two caliphs, this victory was tempered with the Islamic norms but it should not be considered permanent, for Quraysh actually came to power by 'Uthmān's caliphate.

---

[1]. al-Bayān wa l-tabyīn, vol.I, p.345

[2]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.II, pp.294-295

[3]. al-Futūḥ, vol.II, p.99

[4]. Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, vol.II, pp.44-45; from al-Saqīfa by Abū Bakr Djuwharī; al-Aghānī, vol.VI, p.356; al-Fā'iq, vol.II, p.117; al-Nizā' wa l-takhāṣum, p.56

[5]. Murūdj al-dhahab, vol.II, p.343

[6]. Mukhtaṣar Tārīkh Dimashq, vol.II, p.67

[7]. Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā, vol.III, p.64

'Uthmān had never been a weak caliph despite rumors and robustly handled the affairs from scratch. His murder by Prophet (s)'s companions and other protesters did not mean his lack of enough power but because the protest against him was so much that he and his companions could not control it. Besides, leaving the tasks to people like Marwān or other Sufyanī members was not his weakness but he was basically thinking of reposing the caliphate to the Umayyads and he did all this as an introduction to Umayyidize all political affairs. Accidentally as he supposed, he acted intelligently because during the first six years of caliphate, he acted peacefully and tried to consolidate his position. Later, during the second half of the caliphate, he manifested his radical policies and gradually began to change political structure of various regions. In his initiatives, he had the support of Quraysh. He tried to consider their portion instead. But in the second half, his task was to empower the particular tribe of the Umayyads. This infuriated some people of Quraysh. He disentitled people like 'Amr Ibn 'Āṣ and empowered 'Abd Allāh Ibn Sa'd Ibn Abī Sarḥ. Umayyads's members ruling over people spurred anger of many and instigated people to openly revolt against him.

The main point of his regime was one, the victories and the other, more important, was to study this revolt against him, that had a great influence in the Islamic world and most of the subsequent conflicts in Muslim world were arisen from Muslim's approach towards 'Uthmān and his opponents.

REASONS OF ANTI-'UTHMĀN REBELLION

There are so many reasons for rebelling against 'Uthmān mentioned in historical books. Ṭabarī and et.al did not want to record these facts.

"There is something said about this which I hesitate to narrate", Ṭabarī says.[1] Narrating all of what the companions have said about 'Uthmān may cause the Sunnites to have problematic vciews about companions, especially caliphs. Regarding what is said about reasons of rebeling against 'Uthmān, they can be divided into three categories,

(1) The first type of objections concerns the issues through which the caliph was accused of religious heresy.

"How soon you apostatized your Prophet's tradition!" It's quoted from 'Āyisha who told 'Uthmān.[2] "His deeds burnt him, he set fire to God's book and abandoned the Prophet's tradition", said 'Āyisha when she heard about

---

[1]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.IV, pp.356,365; al-Kāmil fi l-tārīkh, vol.III, p.167

[2]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.V, p.48; al-Aghānī, vol.V, p.130

'Uthmān's death.[1] 'Abd al-Raḥmān Ibn 'Awf claimed 'Uthmān had also violated tradition of Shiykhs. When he objected to him, he was thrashed.[2] In a letter written to provoke people against 'Uthmān, it was said that the Book and the Prophet's tradition have been changed, so has Shiykhs' tradition.[3] 'Uthmān's disregarding Hurmuzān's murder by 'Ubayd Allāh raised public anger. 'Uthmān forgave 'Ubayd Allāh instead of retaliating him for the death of three people.[4]

For doing this, Imām blamed 'Uthmān and said, "You will be upbraided in Dooms Day for Hurmuzān." "If I see 'Ubayd Allāh, I will let him obey divine rule even if some people do not like it."[5]

When 'Uthmān saw this, he forced 'Ubayd Allāh away Kūfa at night and there, he gave him a land named Kuwayfa Ibn 'Umar.[6]

People said when 'Uthmān was enlarging the Prophet's mosque. يوسّع مسجد رسول الله ويُغيّر سنّته[7] "He expands the mosque of the Messenger but changes his Sunna."

Another clear example was that unlike the Prophet (s), 'Uthmān prayed completely in Minā, that instigated some people against him.

"This is my belief", said 'Uthmān when they objected.[8]

'Ammār, who was one of his known opponents, said, قتلناه كافراً[9] "We killed him while being an unbeliever."

He stood against rebels in the day of Djamal and asked them, "Why do you fight with us?"

"Because 'Uthmān was murdered while he was a Muslim", they replied.

"We fight with you because he was a pagan when he was killed", 'Ammār said.[10]

"Why did you anathematize 'Uthmān?" Zayd Ibn Arqam was asked.

---

[1]. al-Djamal, p.161; Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, vol.VI, p.216

[2]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.V, p.57; al-Kāmil fi l-tārīkh, vol.III, p.70; al-Muṣannaf, Ibn Abī Shayba, vol.I5, p.223, (India); al-Futūḥ, p.2151

[3]. al-Imāma wa l-siyāsa, vol.I, p.53

[4]. al-Bidāya wa l-nihāya, vol.VII, p.147; Tarīkh al-ya'qūbī, vol.II, p.141

[5]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.V, p.24

[6]. al-Djamal, p.176; Mu'djam al-buldān, vol.IV, p.496; Nahdj al-sa'āda, vol.I, p.146

[7]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.V, p.38

[8]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.V, p.39; al-Bidāya wa l-nihāya, vol.VII, pp.154,171; Sunan Nasā'ī, vol.III, p.12; al-Muwaṭṭa', vol.I, p.282

[9]. al-Mi'yār wa l-muwāzana, p.71

[10]. al-Djamal, p.336

"We had three reasons one of which was not following the Book", he replied.[1]

Iṣfahāni has mentioned some opponents who told 'Uthmān, "Fear God and do not exceed divine limits."[2]

"He had changed the Book", said Muḥammad Ibn Abī Bakr explaining his reason of opposing 'Uthmān.[3]

And it's quoted from him, "'Uthmān has treated unrightfully and distorted Qur'ān's word."

وَمَنْ لَمْ يَحْكُمْ بِمَا أَنزَلَ اللَّهُ فَأُولَئِكَ هُمُ الْكَافِرُونَ.[4]

"Whosoever judges not as to what God has said, he shall be an infidel."

After public objections, he repented in front of them and promised to follow the Book and the Prophet's tradition.[5]

It is quoted from 'Āyisha who named 'Uthmān "Na'thal", old stupid man. اقتلوا نعثلاً فقد كفر.[6] "Murder 'Uthmān who has sought infidelity."

"At first, 'Uthmān behaved as to God's consent but later he changed his path", is also quoted from Mu'āwiya.[7]

One of the objections to 'Uthmān was his unifying the existing Qur'āns. At that time, a scatter of companions in cities and Arabic accents problem in reading Qur'ān escalated the difference among reciters.

It's said that Ḥudhayfa wrote to 'Uthmān, "If it continues to be so, Qur'ān will be distorted." 'Uthmān decided to collect all Qur'āns and eliminate them after arranging a version. He did not consult with some of the people who considered themselves as experts of the job. One of them was 'Abd Allāh Ibn Mas'ūd. He was chosen for this job instead of Zayd Ibn Thābit who was young at the Prophet's time. No matter what help 'Uthmān should get from people like Ibn Mas'ūd and no matter how he treated other

---

1. Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, vol.III, p.51; Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd says this speech is quoted from Zayd in different ways.

2. al-Aghānī, vol.V, p.131

3. al-Bidāya wa l-nihāya, vol.VII, p.175

4. al-Ghārāt, vol.I, p.284

5. al-Futūḥ, vol.II, p.216

6. al-Kāmil fi l-tārīkh, vol.III, p.206

7. Tārīkh Ibn al-wardī, p.203; It should be said, ويل لمن كفّره نمرود Woe unto someone whom Namrūd excommunicates.

versions, (burnt them or ruined in other ways), his original action was right and Imām ʻAlī (a) had highly ratified it.[1]

(2) Another objection to ʻUthmān was devolving upon people of the Umayyads governing the cities. Concerning Abū Sufyān's suggestion in the beginning of caliphate, this seemed normal unless he did not deem it right to do so in his first six years of caliphate. But during the second half, he tried to increase the Umayyads' political and administrative power. The routine was that he had certainly considered Muʻāwiya or another person of the Umayyads as his successor. The problem was not just using these people but people of this family who had other problems. Typically, Ḥakam Ibn Abi l-ʻĀṣ whom the Prophet (s) exiled and Shiykhs did not repatriate, was called back to Medina and was employed to collect charity of Khuzāʻa's tribe.[2] He also employed Ḥārith Ibn Ḥakam to work in Medina market.[3] He also gave the rulership of Kūfa to Walīd Ibn ʻUqba Ibn Abī Muʻayṭ who was his uncle.[4] Walīd whom God called evil-doer[5] and the Prophet (s) promised him hell[6], was obviously a man of sin and iniquity. He deserved punishment because he was a winebibber according to the testament of witnesses. First, ʻUthmān did not accept the testament and Imām ʻAlī (a) blamed him saying, دفعت الشهود وابطلت الحدود "You led away the witnesses and abandoned divine limits."

When he accepted, people were afraid of ʻUthmān to punish him. Imām ʻAlī rose, dropped him on the ground and exerted whip punishment on him.[7]

"Five years in Kūfa", writes a Persian historian about Walīd's drinking wine, "Walīd lived in serendipity, had pleasurful nights, drank by draughts and in the morning reveled in bodily pleasure from red wine, he went to the mosque witlessly and said four units of prayers instead of two as the morning prayers."

And according to a narration he said, "I'm very cheerful today, I can say more prayers if you want."[8]

Walīd Ibn ʻUqba's successor was Saʻīd Ibn ʻĀṣ who was also of this tribe. At first, he tried to behave peacefully. But a little later, he was

---

[1]. Concerning this, see, Ukdhūba taḥrīf al-qur'ān bayn al-shīʻa wa l-Sunna, pp.89-90

[2]. Murūdj al-dhahab, vol.II, p.235; al-Futūḥ, vol.II, p.151

[3]. al-Futūḥ, vol.II, p.151

[4]. Murūdj al-dhahab, vol.II, p.347

[5]. See, Tafsīr books in commentary of the verse, يَا أَيُّهَا الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا إِنْ جَاءَكُمْ فَاسِقٌ بِنَبَإٍ فَتَبَيَّنُوا أَنْ تُصِيبُوا قَوْمًا بِجَهَالَةٍ فَتُصْبِحُوا عَلَى مَا فَعَلْتُمْ نَادِمِينَ.

[6]. Murūdj al-dhahab, vol.II, p.235

[7]. Ibid. vol.II, pp.235-236; al-Futūḥ, vol.II, p.168

[8]. Ḥabīb al-siyar, vol.II, pp.171-173

fulminated by people because of insulting Hishām Ibn 'Utba who had lost his eye in Yarmūk and ironically was called him one-eyed man.

But the serious problem was Iraq – which is fertile lands of Iraq – all belong to Quraysh", he said in Kūfa. Mālik Ashtar was seething with this word. Sa'īd wrote 'Uthmān about Mālik's objection and "people who named themselves readers of Qur'ān are indeed crazy doing such and such", he said. The result was that 'Uthmān exiled Mālik and some others to Damascus.[1] Later, when Kūfa faced escalated riot, 'Uthmān said that Abū Mūsā Ash'arī who was there for 'Umar to be given a rulership.[2]

Baṣra had not a better situation, there after deposing Abū Mūsā Ash'arī he placed 'Abd Allāh Ibn 'Āmir, only twenty five, who was caliph's cousin. According to Ibn A'tham, on Friday, 'Abd Allāh Ibn 'Āmir Ibn Kurayz wanted to preach. He sat on the rostrum and meeting the crowd he was horrified, so he couldn't talk. الحمد لله الذي خلق السماوات والأ رض في ست سنين "Praise be to God (the Exalted) who created heaven and earth in six years", he said as the prologue. [3]

Another 'Uthmān's measure was to depose 'Amr Ibn 'Āṣ form ruling Egypt and leaving him to 'Abd Allāh Ibn Sa'd Ibn Abī Sarḥ. Tyranny of this man who was outcast by the Prophet (s) towards people of Egypt was one of the causes of these people rebelling against 'Uthmān, their coming to Medina to murder him.

"Don't you want", Imām 'Alī (a) told 'Uthmān, "to leave off the Umayyads doing with Muslims' honor and property? I swear if one of your agents tyrannizes people till the sunset, you'll share his sin too."[4] This was the same thing some had said about 'Uthmān, that is to say he was the first one who began to tyrannize[5] because he did not his agents oppressing people. At the same level, Mu'āwiya's reinstatement in Damascus should be mentioned. Damascus was basically considered as 'Uthmān's safe region so he sent his exiles there. The difference between Damascus and Iraq was that Mu'āwiya himself had trained them from the beginning but in Kūfa people like 'Ammār and 'Abd Allāh Ibn Mas'ūd had fostered them. Thus, Iraq revolted against 'Uthmān while Damascus did not move at all.

---

[1]. al-Futūḥ, vol.II, pp.171-173

[2]. Murūdj al-dhahab, vol.II, p.238

[3]. al-Futūḥ, vol.II, p.101 (the proofreader in the footnote quoted this part from the Persian translation.) al-Bayān wa l-tabyin, vol.II, p.251

[4]. Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, vol.IX, p.15 from "Kitāb al-Shuwrā" by Wāqidī.

[5]. al-Aghānī, vol.I7, p.152

According to Ibn Kathīr, people protested why he had unseated the Prophet (s)'s companions.[1]

"You have assigned ignorant rulers for us", was 'Ammār's objection.[2]

'Uthmān's policy in employing the Umayyads to handle the country affairs revealed a kind of "Lineal Monarchy" in Islamic caliphate. This way of ruling was the negation of the Islamic values and the settlement of tribal habitudes as well as marking the hereditariness of caliphate. In this kind of statehood, each of the princes came to power in a province. Anywhere the found a fertile land, they possessed. Sa'īd Ibn 'Āṣ of the Umayyads, ruler of Kūfa, named the lands of Iraq "Garden of Quraysh"[3] so people's protest against 'Uthmān began here.[4]

(3) The third objection of rebells to 'Uthmān was, his prodigality to the Umayyads' family. These prodigality which at first to all Quraysh eminent people and then just to the Umayyads, was at a very large extent. The opposition of Ṭalḥa and Zubayr was because of this recent thorough turnabout of 'Uthmān for the Umayyads.

Thus, "If he gives money to you, you will be satisfied, but if he gives it to his own kinsmen, you'll offend him"[5], 'Abd Allāh Ibn 'Amr truly said about some of the opponents. Moreover, lavishing and aristocracy in 'Uthmān's government versus the past, spurred opposition. In Medina, 'Uthmān built a sturdy house of stone with elegant wooden doors[6] and this dazzled a lot of people, comparing financial policy of 'Umar.

When he was objected, "I've made this house using Bayt al-Māl (public property), won't it belong to you after me?"[7] he replied.

He conferred Ḥārith Ibn Ḥakam (Marwān's brother) the land which is said to be of the Prophet (s)'s charity. Also, Fadak over which Zahrā (a) and Abū Bakr had a disagreement and had taken it as public belonging was granted to Marwān Ibn Ḥakam, caliph's son-in-law.[8] A poet compared Shiykhs' dealing with 'Uthmān about Bayt al-Māl in his poem and in the end, he mentioned about granting to Marwān the fifth share of African booties which were nearly equal to five thousands of Dīnārs.

---

[1]. al-Bidāya wa l-nihāya, vol.VII, p.170

[2]. al-Muṣannaf, Ibn Abī Shayba, vol.I5, p.221

[3]. Ansāb al-Ashrūf, vol.IV, p.529, No.1376

[4]. Mukhtaṣar Tārikh Dimashq, vol.IX, p.308

[5]. Tārikh al-madīnat al-munawwara, vol.III, p.1115

[6]. Murūdj al-dhahab, vol.II, p.332

[7]. al-Muwaffaqiyyāt, p.602

[8]. al-Ma'ārif, p.195

وأعطيت مروان خمس العباد فهيهات شأوك ممن سعى[1]

"Thou granted Marwān a share fifth of Allāh's servants, thy ideals are actually far from those in pursuit of virtues."

According to Ibn Qutayba, 'Uthmān paid Ḥakam Ibn Abi l-'Āṣ one hundred thousand dhms[2] and according to other sources, three hundred thousand dhms.[3] Also, he conferred Khālid Ibn Usayd four hundred thousands dhms.[4] 'Abd Allāh Ibn Sa'd Ibn Abī Sarḥ had also benefited from African booties.[5] 'Uthmān set high marriage portion for his wives too.[6] Considering the given historical information, 'Allama Amīnī has tabulated these grants to the mentioned people as well as to people like Zubayr, Sa'd Ibn Abī Waqqāṣ, Ya'lā Ibn Umayya, Zayd Ibn Thābit and the like.[7]

Concerning financial affairs, 'Uthmān struggled with some people of whom Abūdhar was the most important one. It is said that Abūdhar attaked hard on 'Uthmān citing "verse of Kanz". According to Suyūṭī, 'Uthmān tried to omit "and" (واو) from the beginning of the verse so that it just refers to the people of Book. But because of Ubayy Ibn Ka'b's strong objection, he turned.[8] Also, 'Uthmān had a difference with Abūdhar over other financial affairs.[9] The result of 'Uthmān's opinion which he had gained by asking Ka'b al-Aḥbār's legal opinion, was that Bayt al-Māl belongs to the caliph and he can use it in whatever way he wishes.

"You are our "stockman" !" said 'Uthmān to Ibn Mas'ūd who had the Bayt al-Māl of Kūfa.

"I thought", Ibn Mas'ūd replied, "I was "Muslims' stockman". Now, if I'm supposed to be your stockman, this is the key all yours."

When Ibn Mas'ūd came to Medina from Kūfa and gave him the key of Bayt al-Māl in such a way, after outraging, 'Uthmān ordered to wallop him and dump him from the mosque. Objecting to 'Uthmān, Imām 'Alī (a) took Ibn Mas'ūd to his house. Ibn Mas'ūd died two years before 'Uthmān and had made a will stating that 'Ammār should pray on his body rather than

---

[1]. Ibid. p.195; Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.V, p.27,38

[2]. al-Ma'ārif, p.194

[3]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.V, p.28. This money came from the poll tax ruled to be received.

[4]. al-Ma'ārif, pp.194,195

[5]. al-Bidāya wa l-nihāya, vol.VII, p.172

[6]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.V, p.13

[7]. al-Ghadīr, vol.VIII, p.286

[8]. al-durr al-manthūr, vol. III, p 232

[9]. Murūdj al-dhahab, vol.II, pp.339-340

'Uthmān.[1] The same thing happened to 'Abd Allāh Ibn Arqam and he also said he thought he was the Muslims' stockman, but now that it was determined he was the caliph's stockman, he didn't want to take the responsibility.[2]

"O Abā Isḥāq!", 'Uthmān asked Ka'b Ibn al-Aḥbār in the presence of Abūdhar, " what do you think about collecting the money which is given as offerings, spent for desolate people and used for piety (be given to relative)."

"I wish charity for its possessor", Ka'b Ibn Abi l-Aḥbār replied. Abūdhar boiled and raised his stick to beat his head.[3]

Abūdhar told 'Uthmān quoting from the Prophet (s) "The dearest of you to me is the one who keeps the promise given to me, so that he will join me; you are all involved in earthly things except me who have kept my promise." [4]

Mu'āwiya called the property of Bayt al-Māl "Māl Allāh" (divine property) to confine possession to himself or basically limit it to himself. Abūdhar objected why he called "Māl al-Muslimīn" as "Māl Allāh".[5] Perchance, this was proved by another story. According to Zuhrī, in the treasury of Bayt al-Māl, there was so much remittance 'Uthmān had granted some to his kinsmen. Thus, some people quipped him.

"This is "Māl Allāh" which is given to anyone I wish", he said after being told.

When 'Ammār opposed him, they walloped him to fall in a faint.[6] In practical policy of 'Uthmān and his agents, there can be seen a strong mammonism. Mu'āwiya led these activities and was in power in Damascus. Later, he will be talked about more.

Mawdūdī begins to discuss 'Uthmān's leaving to his kinsmen the important provinces in his book under the title of "from the leading caliphate

---

[1]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.V, pp 31, 36, 37; Tārīkh Ya'qubī, vol. II, p 171

[2]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.V, pp 58,88

[3]. Tārīkh al-madīnat al-munawwara, vol.II, pp.1306-1307 and in its footnote, Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā, vol.IV, p.232; al-Ḥilyat al-'awliyā', vol.I, p.160; Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.V, p.2860; Sharḥ nahdi al-balāgha, Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, vol.II, p.376; vol.III, p.54; Nihāyat al-'irab, vol.I9, p.443; al-Tamhīd wa l-bayān, sheet, 70

[4]. Tārīkh al-madīnat al-munawwara, vol.II, p.1040

[5]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.IV, p.83

[6]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.IV, p.580, No.1485. Abūdhar said, "Mu'āwīya intends to name Muslims off everything." This is an interesting idea. It will be considered that the reason for attaching caliph to God is for naming off people as well as removing his responsibility in front of the people and God.

to emperorship". In his opinion, the rule of these agents who were mostly of "suburbs", had been a kind of tribal reign over Muslim society.[1] 'Uthmān entrusted Damascus to Mu'āwiya and kept him as the ruler for that region for several years, considering this as one of his faults. He considers it as the result of Mu'āwiya's independence and not obeying the headquarters.[2] 'Uthmān's justification for this prodigality was that unlike 'Umar who was not interested in piety, he had decided to do so![3]

As far as dealing of 'Uthmān and his companions with Bayt al-Māl is concerned, one of the main reasons of rebelling against 'Uthmān should go to the tribes' eminent people who got some property for themselves and other Muslims by force of sword and now seeing that Quraysh, especially the tribe of Umayyads, was ready to seize it. This challenge actually appeared between the ruling townsmen of Quraysh and warrior nomadic tribes. A scholar[4] indicating this theory, regards the central reign as a sign of Islamic orientation! and consider the protests of cities as crystallizing nationalism of tribes and tribal norms. He regards murdering of 'Uthmān as the victory of "cities" and in fact, victory of tribalism. What seems right is that Quraysh was up to domineer on the fate of Islamic nation resulting in instigation of the tribes. In fact, 'Uthmān, in one sense, is the crystallization of departing Islamic orientations towards tribal norms and his killing fails to stand for the end of Islamic orientation and dominating tribalism.

In our opinion, the right view is that the control of Quraysh over the caliphate caused the protest of the tribes which had taken the whole weight of the conquests while watching that Quraysh had confined two things to itself, one was the reign and the other was wealth; in this situation, Iraqi tribes were tricked.

"The city of Iraq", when Sa'īd Ibn 'Āṣ Umawī said in Kūfa, "which is the rich lands of it, is the garden of Quraysh."

"Do you consider what God has given us by means of our swords, as a garden for yourself and your tribe?"[5] replied Mālik Ashtar.

According to al-Dūrī[1], this financial distinction between Quraysh and non-Quraysh was somewhat originated from 'Umar's financial policy;

---

[1]. Khilāfat wa Mulūkiyyat, pp.119-121

[2]. Ibid. pp.129-130

[3]. Rabi' al-abrār, vol.III, p.575

[4]. Khayr al-dīn sawī influenced by his professor, 'Abd al-'Azīz al-Dūrī in the book, Taṭawwur al-fikr al-siyāsi 'Ind ahl al-Sunna, pp.42-43

[5]. Murūdj al-dhahab, vol.II, p.337; Tārikh al-ṭabarī, vol.IV, pp.469-470. Concerning the opinion of one of the people in Muhādjirūn's ruling for selecting caliph and monopolizing caliphate.

however, Abū Bakr had equally divided the property and conditioned people's records just as to their divine return. 'Umar divided the property of Bayt al-Māl as to the their records. This caused the priority of emigrants (Muhādjirūn) and helpers (Anṣār) over Arabs and tribes which shouldered the whole weight of conquests after the Prophet (s). The assets of the headmen of the helpers represent the effects of 'Umar's financial policy which 'Uthmān followed. When 'Uthmān sent Sa'īd Ibn 'Āṣ to Kūfa as the ruler, he wrote to 'Uthmān that, in the city, noble families and pedigree families with a record were subdued and Arabs (tribes) had overcome them.

"Advantage those with a precedence over them", 'Uthmān wrote him back, "and make others follow them, ... dedicate to each, his particular status."[2]

To al-Dūrī, the main reason of uprising against 'Uthmān was primarily anti-Quraysh tribes. It should be mentioned that 'Uthmān was the crystallization of tribal orientation towards advantaging Quraysh dominance, especially the Umayyads, over the whole Islamic world. However, most of the rebels were the idealists who wanted the victory of true Islam. Imām 'Alī (a)'s coming to power is proof of that. Also, Mr. Baydūn finds measure of protesters a kind of Islamic orientation and that of 'Uthmān's a tribal one.[3] Of course, it can be said that one of the results of this rioting was to weaken the central government, one main problem of Imām 'Alī (a).

The last word is that a list of 'Uthmān's wrongs can be found in a letter the helpers had written to him.[4]

'UTHMĀN'S OPPONENTS

The dominating 'Uthmānī view of Islamic society since the reign of the Umayyads (41 H.) resulted in acquitting and purifying 'Uthmān from any kind of charge. The Umayyads imposed this view on the Islamic society except Iraq which slightly stood up against it. Thus, the Sunnites assented 'Uthmān's oppressedness and rightfulness against the dissenters. With this view, how did they judge dissenters? One way was that they realistically knew his dissenters and considered them as their religion enemies. If they had chosen to do so, the leading companions would be exposed to accusation. Another way was to consider his dissenters people, with no companions among them, who had come from Iraq and Egypt. They chose

---

[1]. Muqaddama fī tārīkh ṣadr al-islām, pp.50-58

[2]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.IV, p.279

[3]. See, Min Dawlat 'Umar Ilā Dawlat 'Abd al-malik, P.107

[4]. al-Imāma wa l-siyāsa, vol.I, p.50

this way and when some companions were said to be among 'Uthmān's opponents, falsely saying that he had sent their sons to 'Uthmān's house to defend him (and it is not apparent why they did not go themselves), they began to support the companions in order not to be accused of being 'Uthmān's enemies.

It should be noted that "Sunnites historians" deemed it necessary to avoid mentioning companions' imperfection.[1] If any one narrated their imperfection, it meant that he was a Shi'ites Muslim. Clearly, the implication of one of the companions in killing 'Uthmān was obviously regarded as his imperfection. With this compiled policy, most of the historical facts related to political positions of companions faded away. Here, forgery happened in two forms, first, not to right the truths of history, second, to make fake news. During the events of this era, Sayf Ibn 'Umar, the lie-maker, radically denied the presence of companions and knew an unknown person called 'Abd Allāh Ibn Saba' responsible for all these months-long serious events in which all of Islamic cities, especially the caliphate center in Medina played a great role. According to Sayf, traveling to different cities, this man had provoked people against 'Uthmān[2] and had been able to arouse Kūfa and Egypt. In Sayf's opinion, 'Abd Allāh was also the founder of Shī'a religion. If Sayf is true, it is not clear what should be said about a society so fragile that a Jewish can induce it against the caliph and it ends up murdering him? What is certain is that first in all scholastic books Sayf is accused of lying and heresy. Second, there is not such a thing in any of the books which were the first sources of Islamic history and even the name of 'Abd Allāh Ibn Saba' is not mentioned. In other words, from all sources of 3rd and 4th centuries remained, Ṭabarī had just used Sayf's books and for this he kept his forgery. However, in some books like Akhbār al-

---

[1]. Aḥmad Ibn Ḥanbal seriously banned Sunnites narrators to narrate the companions' imperfection. He believed if anyone narrated these things about companions, he should be avoided. Some time, he Himself listened to traditions through 'Abd al-Razzāq Ṣan'ānī. When 'Abd al-Razzāq retold these kinds of narrations, Aḥmad kept away and he was back to class sessions when he began new subjects. In other cases, when the companions imperfection were discussed, Aḥmad covered his ears with two fingers. "It can not be quoted from 'Ubayd Allāh Ibn Mūsā 'Abasī", he said because يحدث باحاديث فيها تنقص لاصحاب رسول الله (ص) He narrated hadiths which lowered rank of the Prophet's companions. Also he did not allow any one to quote a person who imprecated Mu'āwiya. Some times, accounting that companions had said these words while they were angry, he did not permit their narrations. It is said that Sālim Ibn Abī Muṭī' took Abū 'Awāna's book and ruined the main traditions which were concerned with imperfection of companions. As for these words and similar narrations, al-Sana, Abū Khallāl, pp.500-511

[2]. Tārikh Tārikh al-ṭabarī, vol.III, pp.378-379

Ṭiwāl, al-Imāmat wa al-Sīyāsa, Ansāb al-ashrāf and Tārīkh Khālīfat Ibn Khayyāṭ, there is nothing mentioned about these events. Unfortunately, the next books like al-Bidāyat wa l-nihāya and Kāmil Ibn Athīr which used Ṭabarī have cited these forgeries and in recent years this has been accepted since it is mostly consistent with the Sunnites beliefs.

Now, a lot of Sunnites and Shi'ites researchers and orientalists seriously remain doubtful about it and do not concede it. Of the Shi'ites researchers is Murtaḍā Askarī [1] and of the Sunnites ones is Ṭāhā Ḥusayn.[2] The forgery is also revealed to the orientalists.

Most of the Muslim historians[3], Bernard Lewis writes, attribute the commencement of revolutionary Shi'ism to 'Abd Allāh Ibn Saba' who co-lived with 'Alī Ibn Abī Ṭālib (a). He was a Yemenī Jewish and had been publicizing 'Alī's divinity and finally was burnt because of his deeds.

In this way, the starting point of hard-line Shi'ite Muslims and exaggerators is ascribed to him and to a Jewish principle through him. Yet, new investigations show that this is some sort of circumstances and second century thoughts into the past rendered by "hadith-writers". Wellhausen and Friedlander by means of narration and looking into sources have demonstrated that the conspiracy attributed to Ibn Saba' is heresy coming after. Kietani, in a substantiated chapter, has shown that an intrigue with an ideology and organization ascribed to Ibn Saba' is beyond imagination in an Arabially patriarchal and tribal community in 35 A.H..[4] Anyhow, in so far as it is related to 'Uthmān's opponents, a great deal of facts can be obtained through the quest for historical and literary sources. With regard to what has been mentioned in these sources, the companions of the prophet, especially the Anṣār, have played a leading role in instigating the people against 'Uthmān. By probing into various sources, 'Allāma Amīnī has stated that more than 80 names of the companions are included among 'Uthmān's opponents, such as, Ṭalḥa, Zubayr, 'Āyisha, 'Ammār, Abūdhar, 'Abd al-Raḥmān Ibn 'Awf, 'Abd Allāh Ibn Mas'ūd, Miqdād, Ḥudjr Ibn 'Adī, Hāshim Ibn 'Utba, Sahl Ibn Ḥunayf, Abū Ayyūb Anṣārī, Djābir Ibn 'Abd Allāh Anṣārī whose oppositions against 'Uthmān have benn quoted by 'Allāma Amīnī.[5] It should be taken into consideration that all of them did not believe in the murder of 'Uthmān or nor did they deem it advisable, yet

---

[1]. In his three books, this researcher has studied Sayf's narrations and has correctly shown his style of writing which is a kind of story telling.

[2]. al-Fitnat al-kubrā, the chapter on 'Abd Allāh Ibn Saba'

[3]. As mentioned, "this majority" is the people who used Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, otherwise the first rate books of the third century had not basically cited these events.

[4]. Tārīkh Ismā'iliyān, p.33

[5]. al-Ghadīr, vol.VIII and IX

they criticized his political- religious actions sharply. Abū Sa'īd Khudrī said, About 800 companions have implicated in 'Uthmān's killing.[1] Busr Ibn Arṭāt's bitter talk to the Medinans in 40 A.H. is evidence that Anṣār were strongly implicated in killing 'Uthmān.[2]

Ṭalḥa and Zubayr were ranked among the most hardline critics of 'Uthmān. Imām 'Alī (a) used to say about them, they are demanding of me a right which they have abandoned, and a blood that they have themselves shed.[3] Numerous sources have revealed Ṭalḥa's strong enmity towards 'Uthmān.[4] Due to this very fact, Marwān Ibn Ḥakam, who stayed alongside Ṭalḥa in the battle of Djamal, observing that the war was coming to an end put an arrow in the bow and killed Ṭalḥa. In this way, he took 'Uthmān's revenge against Ṭalḥa.

Afterwards, 'Abd al-Malik Marwān said, "Unless my father had told me that he has killed Ṭalḥa, I would murder all Ṭalḥa's progeny in revenge for 'Uthmān's blood."[5] While laying siege to 'Uthmān's house, Ṭalḥa was reportedly the head of house guards and he did not let people, food and water in the house.[6]

Yet, becoming informed of the delivery of food and water, he said, "What sort of siege is this one in which food and water are delivered?"[7] When 'Uthmān was stopped having water, Imām met Ṭalḥa and spoke to him about letting water in 'Uthmān's house, however, Ṭalḥa was unwilling to do so.[8] Some day 'Uthmān sent somebody after Imām 'Alī (a) and told him that Ṭalḥa was killing him through thirst, while it's more worthwhile to be killed with the sword.[9] Shiykh Mufīd has devoted a full chapter to his stances against 'Uthmān.[10]

---

[1]. Tārīkh al-madinat al-munawwara, vol.III, p.1175

[2]. al-Ghārāt, p.219 (Persian translation)

[3]. Nahdj al-sa'āda, vol.I, pp.247-248

[4]. al-Ma'ārif, p.228; Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.V, p.80; Tārīkh al-madina al-munawwara, vol.III,p.1169 كان أشد الصحابة على عثمان طلحة بن عبيد الله Ṭalḥa Ibn 'Abd Allāh among the companions treated 'Uthmān most harshly.

[5]. Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā, vol.III, p.223; Tārīkh al-madīnat al-munawwara, vol.II, p.1170

[6]. al-Djamal, p.141, see, Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.IV, p.385; al-'Iqd al-farīd, vol.IV, p.290

[7]. al-Imāma wa l-siyāsa, vol.I, p.57

[8]. Tārīkh al-madīnat al-munawwara, vol.III, p.1169

[9]. Ibid, vol.III, p.1202

[10]. al-Djamal, pp. 145-146

'Amr Ibn 'Āṣ was also ranked among bitter dissenters of 'Uthmān.[1] 'Āyisha also attacked 'Uthmān strongly,[2] when her grant of bounty was cut under 'Uthmān's order.[3] It was she who called 'Uthmān Na'thal, an old stupid man due to his bushy beard.[4]

According to a witness, I was in mosque when 'Uthmān entered, then 'Āyisha yelled, "O traitor! O sinner! You spoiled the servants through breach of trust; if five units of prayer never existed, people would come to you and thereby, you were slaughtered as if you were a sheep."

'Uthmān revealed to her[5] the verse related to Noah's wife.[6] It seeds that in these last days, every time when 'Uthmān came to mosque for prayer, he was rebuked by 'Āyisha whose house was adjacent to the mosque. As to Balādhurī, once this objection led to a clash between those for and against 'Āyisha and 'Uthmān so that they thrashed each other with shoes.

Balādhurī further says, تلك أوّل قتال وقع بين المسلمين بعد النبي (ص) "It was the first clash occurred between Muslims after the Prophet (s)."[7]

Muḥammad, the son of Ṭalḥa, maintained that 'Āyisha is responsible for one-third of 'Uthmān's blood.[8]

Sa'd Waqqāṣ also has been quoted as saying, "'Uthmān was killed with 'Āyisha's unshielded swords."[9]

There is historically much to tell about 'Ammār, Abūdhar and 'Abd al-Raḥmān Ibn 'Awf and many others, insofar as there will be no room for doubt.

At the time when the revolt was kicked against 'Uthmān, there were few who would agree with him. Specifically when the Medinans received a letter sealed by 'Uthmān to Egypt's ruler in which murder of people was ordered, public anger was fired up.[10] When Mu'āwiya put a question to 'Uthmān, Umm al-Khayr answered, People selected him as a caliph, which they

---

1. Tārīkh al-madīnat al-munawwara, vol.III, p.1089

2. al-Mi'yār wa l-muwāzana, p.27; Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā, vol.III, p.37

3. al-Futūḥ, vol.III, p.123

4. al-Mi'yār wa l-muwāzana, p.27

5. al-Djamal, p.148; al-Futūḥ, vol.II, p.225; Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, vol.VI, p.215

6. Taḥrīm, verse 10

7. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.V, p.34

8. Tārīkh al-madīnat al-munawwara, vol.III, p.1173

9. Ibid, p.1174

10. Tārīkh al-khamīs, vol.II, p.261

actually hated him. Afterwards, they killed him, while being pleased to do so.[1]

Anṣār were considered to be the main residents of Medina. Their disagreement with Quraysh was the motive behind the first mistake they made in Saqīfa. In the event of the assassination of 'Uthmān, beloved to Quraysh, most of Anṣār were numbered among 'Uthmān's dissenters, whereas a few where among 'Uthmān's assenters. The anti-'Uthmān movement was led by Anṣār, Muhādjirūn and a number of the Kūfiyāns and Egyptians. Yet, in as much as Medina was Anṣār's place of abode, the Umayya put the blame for this event on Anṣār. It was then they decided to take revenge of them. As far as Yazīd is concerned, the cruel suppression of Medina in Ḥarra event by Muslim Ibn 'Uqba, branded as prodigal due to his abundant massacre, is regarded as 'Uthmān's retaliation against the Medinans.[2]

Thābit, the son of 'Abd Allāh Ibn Zubayr used to say to 'Abd al-Malik, "The Medinans downgraded 'Uthmān in as much as he was killed among them, and they did not support him."[3] Some time, Thābit insulted the Syrians.

'Uthmān's son told him, "You insult them, for your father was killed by them."

He replied, "Yes!" But O 'Uthmān's son! Beware. Your father has been killed by Muhādjirūn and Anṣār.[4]

Sa'd Ibn 'Abd al-Raḥmān said to Ḥassān, "A group of Anṣār went to Mu'āwiya in Syria.

Mu'āwiya asked them, "Which one, Quraysh or you, are more helpful?... You humiliated 'Uthmān when he was under siege and killed his followes in Djamal."[5]

After 'Uthmān's murder, 'Abd Allāh Ibn 'Āmir, Baṣra's ruler, considered his killing as an unjust action. In Djārīya Ibn Qudāma's opinion, 'Uthmān was killed in the presence of Anṣār and Muhādjirūn, yet they showed no reaction against murderers.[6] In this respect, a poet has said,

إن ابن عفان أصيب وحوله إخوانه وجماعة من الأنصار

---

[1]. Ṣubḥ al-a'shā, vol.I, p.251

[2]. al-Aghānī, vol.I, p.26

[3]. al-Muwaffaqiyyāt, p.152; al-Imtā' wa l-Mu'ānisa, vol.III, p.165

[4]. al-Imtā' wa l-Mu'ānisa, vol.III, p.165

[5]. Ibid, vol.III, pp.168-169

[6]. al-Futūḥ, vol.II, pp 269-270

"'Uthmān Ibn 'Affān was murdered when his brothers and a group of Anṣār surrounded him."[1]

In continuation, this poet regrets that how is it possible for those who call themselves the companions of the Prophet (s) not to support 'Uthmān. Mu'āwiya asked Abū Ṭufayl, were you one of killers of 'Uthmān? He replied, "No, I was present over there, however, I did not advocated him."

Mu'āwiya further asked, "Why?"

Abū Ṭufayl answered, "Since Muhādjirūn and Anṣār didn't came to his help."[2]

Thereafter, Sa'd Ibn Musayyib was questioned by people as why did the companions of the prophet (s) downgrade 'Uthmān?[3]

'Abd al-Malik used to say to the Medinans, "As long as we recall the Umayya's killing and you remembered Ḥarra, nor can we like each other."[4]

So due to the Umayya's animosity towards Anṣār the Umayya were obliged to induce Akhṭal, the poet to, satirize Anṣār.[5] Concerning the role of Anṣār in 'Uthmān's murder, it's interesting to mention 'Uthmān's letter to Mu'āwiya when bringing him under siege, in which is was written, The Medinans have become atheist, have baulked at following their Imām and have broken their promise.[6] Ḥassān Ibn Thābit, being one of the tenacious supporters of 'Uthmān in these days, points out the matter of Anṣār's downgrading 'Uthmān in his poems. In fact, in addition to the following interpretation,

خذلته الأنصار اذ حضر الموت وكانت ولاته الأنصار

"Anṣār, even though having sainthood, was present when 'Uthmān was killed, but they left him alone."[7]

He further mentions the implication of Ṭalḥa, Zubayr, Muḥammad Ibn Abī Bakr and 'Ammār in the assassination of 'Uthmān. The Umayya's hostility to Anṣār, the 'Uthmānids preferred Syria to Medina.[8] Afterwards,

---

[1] Rabi' al-abrār, vol.III, p.341; al-Futūḥ, vol.II, p.263

[2]. al-Muwaffaqiyyāt, p.154

[3]. al-'Iqd al-farīd, vol.IV, p.287

[4]. al-Baṣā'ir wa l-dhakā'ir, vol.I, p.18

[5]. al-Aghānī, vol.XV, p.107

[6]. Tārikh al-ṭabarī, vol.III, p.402

[7] Murūdj al-dhahab, vol.II, p.347

[8]. al-Imāma wa l-siyāsa, vol.I, p.42; Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā, vol.III, p.71; Ibn Abī Shayba, al-Muṣannaf, vol.LXX, pp.204,205,212,223,227; Tārikh al-ṭabarī, vol.III, p.421

Yaḥyā, the son of Ḥakam Ibn Abi l-'Āṣ called Medina as an "evil land" and Syria as a "sacred land".[1] This interpretation reveals their aversion to Islam.

The evidence indicates that Muhādjirūn and Anṣār have played a central role in opposition to 'Uthmān. Historians have quoted the content of the letter Muhādjirūn wrote to the cities (aiming at) asking them to go to Medina for the reform of circumstances. This letter contained, Form the early Muhādjirūn and the remaining members of council to the Egyptians including Anṣār and followers (Tābi'īn). Come to us and find out Caliphate, before it brings the people to an end. Verily, Qur'ān has been distorted, the tradition of the Prophet has been changed and the Shiykhs' rules have been altered. We hereby adjure all the remaining of and Tābi'īn by Allāh to return to us if they believe in Allāh and the Resurrection Day... the caliphate coming after the Prophet was the caliphate of Prophet hood and blessing, whereas it's already become kingdom and sovereignty.[2] Based on another narration, a group of the companions of the prophet (s) assembled and after discussion determined on writing a letter to 'Uthmān in order to remind him of his violating the Sunna. This letter, a highly significant document was given to 'Uthmān by 'Ammār, yet it was answered in no way but thrashing 'Ammār.[3] It is appropriate to quote a remark from Hāshim Ibn 'Utba known as Abū Mirqāl on his answer to a Syrian in Ṣiffīn who said that your Imām does not say prayer and has killed our caliph; what do you have to do with Ibn 'Affān? إنما قتله أصحاب محمد وقرّاء الناس[4] "Verily Muḥammad's companions as well as public Qur'ān-reciters killed him."

'Uthmān had a scarcity of assenters in Medina, each financially benefited from 'Uthmān in one way or another. Among them was 'Abd Allāh Ibn Sallām. He was amongst the Muslim-turned Jews who went up the 'Uthmān's roof in the course of the siege of his house and said, "I found 'Uthmān's name is Torah in which it's been mentioned, Your caliph is the oppressed, the martyr."

People shouted, O the Jew! He's fed you up and dressed your body.[5] This very narration should have been made at a later time by those who were apt to label 'Uthmān as martyr in Torah. Elsewhere it goes to say that such an issue has also been touched upon in terms of the second caliph. Anyhow, 'Abd Allāh Ibn Sallām has been ranked among the tenacious assenters of

---

[1]. al-Aghānī, vol.LXXX, p.334

[2]. al-Imāma wa l-siyāsa, vol.I, pp. 53-54

[3]. al-Imāma wa l-siyāsa, vol.I, p.50

[4] Waq'at Ṣiffīn, p.354

[5]. al-Imāma wa l-siyāsa, vol.I, p.61. Most probably this remark, "... I found 'Uthmān's name in Torah" has been ascribed to 'Abd Allāh Ibn Sallām afterwards. Yet, he has been amongst 'Uthmān's assenters.

'Uthmān.[1] Zayd Ibn Thābit was another supporter of 'Uthmān once he began to advocate 'Uthmān, people accused him of a support which was due to being fed up by 'Uthmān. Zayd was keeper of 'Uthmān's treasury.[2] He was later on profited by Mu'āwiya's treasury.[3]

Wāqidī says, "Among the companions of the Prophet (s) no one supported 'Uthmān but Zayd Ibn Thābit, Abū Usayd Sā'idī, Ka'b Ibn Mālik and Ḥassān Ibn Thābit."[4]

According to Ibn Isḥāq, when 'Uthmān migrated to Medina, he went to Aws Ibn Thābit, Ḥassān's brother. Thereafter, 'Uthmān appealed to Ḥassān. Then, after his killing, Ḥassān cried for him.[5]

To Mas'ūdī, وكان حسان عثمانياً منحرفاً[6] "Ḥassān was both a supporter of 'Uthmān and a deviator."

In addition to the persons mentioned by Wāqidī, Abū Hurayra has also been reckoned among 'Uthmān's supporters.[7]

Apart from a handful of supporters, 'Uthmān died in Medina in such a stranger hood that no one dared to bury him in Baqī'. Only few of them buried him by night in a place called "Ḥashsh Kawkab", a garden which was later on attached to Baqī' by Mu'āwiya.[8]

'UTHMĀN'S CONTACT WITH DISSENTERS

As long as 'Uthmān found himself in high position, he did not surrender to dissenters' criticisms by no means whatsoever. Yet, he treated harshly to them and tried to render them obedient and calm through trashing and exile. The Umayya was all 'Uthmān's concern. Indeed, 'Uthmān was yielded and, in a sense, feeble towards the members of this family; however, he treated the great companions of the Prophet (s) having a longer precedence bitterly and with asperity. This was highly influential in inciting the people once more. Contact with Abūdhar who had a morally and spiritually special position in community can be mentioned typically. Abūdhar strived to keep

---

[1]. Tārīkh al-madīnat al-munawwara, vol.III, pp.1175-1186

[2]. al-Futūḥ, vol.II, p.222

[3]. Tārīkh Abūzar'a al-dimashqī, vol.I, p.190

[4]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.V, p.60

[5]. Ibn Hishām, al-Sīrat al-nabawiyya, vol.II, p.479

[6]. Murūdj al-dhahab, vol.I, p.347

[7]. See, Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā, vol. III, pp. 89-170 and vol. IV, p.340

[8]. al-Ma'ārif, p.197. Ibn Qutayba says, Ḥash means garden and Kawkab is the name of a man from Anṣār.

'Uthmān away from extravagance. It was indeed all Abūdhar's concern. Yet, 'Uthmān brought a charge of sedition against him saying, "You are a man fond of sedition."[1]

Then, Abūdhar being forbidden from indulging said to 'Uthmān, "Even if I am put to the sword, I won't refrain from narrating what the Prophet (s) has said."

Abūdhar supported Imām 'Alī explicitly. He used to quote the Prophet (s) as saying, "There will be a sedition thereafter, if you were entrapped by it, so adhere to Allāh's Book and 'Alī."

He further quotes the Prophet (s) as saying, "The first who shakes hands with me in the Day of Judgment."[2] 'Uthmān consulted with Ka'b al-Aḥbār whether it is permissible for Imām to withdraw whatever he wants of the public treasury and return it whenever he wishes.

Ka'b replied him, "Yes."

Then, he was objected by Abūdhar, "O you the son of Jew! Are you teaching us our religion?"[3] After viewing such a situation, 'Uthmān sent Abūdhar to Syria on exile. There, Abūdhar did not desist from objecting and criticizing. Thus, through a letter, Mu'āwiya deemed his presence dangerous for Syria and even for Iraq and asked 'Uthmān to let him return to Medina and so did 'Uthmān. Then, Abūdhar was exiled to Medina on a hard horseback,[4] while his thigh run out of flesh. Afterwards, his objection to 'Uthmān resulted in his exile to Rabaḍa where he died in isolation.

Abūdhar, about whom the Prophet (s) had told, "Abūdhar is the most truthful under shadow of sky, was accused by 'Uthmān of being a liar."[5]

Accordingly, Imām 'Alī was inclined to back Abūdhar inexorably. At the time of exiling Abūdhar, 'Uthmān ordered people not to see Abūdhar off, however. Imām 'Alī together with his descendants did so. Although, he objected Imām 'Alī,

Imām said to Abūdhar, "O Abūdhar! You become angry with them for the sake of Allāh and they were afraid of themselves for the fear of their worldly life." At the time when Abūdhar was seen off by 'Alī (a) and his

---

[1]. al-Futūḥ, vol. II, p.158

[2]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.II, p.118

[3]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.V, p.52

[4]. al-Ma'ārif, p.195; al-Istī'āb, vol.I, p.214; al-Futūḥ, vol.II, pp.1580-189; Tārīkh al-madīnat al-munawwara, vol.III, p.1038. According to Ibn A'tham, 'Uthmān said to Abūdhar, "Go out of Medina." Abūdhar answered, "I want to go to Syria." 'Uthmān did not accept. Abūdhar proposed Iraq, but then again 'Uthmān rejected it, and said to him, " I said you to the worst city, that is, Rabaḍa. So go over there and never return here."

[5]. al-Futūḥ, vol.II, p.157

descendants, he cast a look at Imām and said, "Seeing you and your descendants reminds me of the Prophet (s)'s remark about you and makes me burst into tears."[1] He passed away in Rabaḍa, while according to his will, nobody including commander, leader and mail had the right to shroud and bury him.[2]

'Uthmān's contact with Abūdhar was so bitter and provocative that afterwards Djāḥiẓ wrote, "People killed 'Uthmān, for he had exiled Abūdhar."[3] It is a ridiculous point to write that, afterwards, Abūdhar went to Rabaḍa through his own will, not on exile.

Not only Abūdhar, but also most of the Kūfiyāns who objected to Sa'īd Ibn 'Āṣ were sent to Syria on exile by order of caliph. In caliph's opinion, Syria was too a secure place. It should be said principally that 'Uthmān did the chief part of Mu'āwiya.

The on-exile persons, well-known as Kūfa's "readers" are as follows, Mālik Ashtar, Zayd, Ṣa'ṣa'a (Ṣūḥān's children), Shurayḥ Ibn 'Awfī, Ḥurqūṣ Ibn Zuhayr, Djundab Ibn Zuhayr, Ka'b Ibn 'Abada, 'Adī Ibn Ḥātim, Kidām Ibn Ḥadhrī, Mālik Ibn Ḥabīb, Qays Ibn 'Uṭārud, Ziyād Ibn Ḥafṣa, Yazīd Ibn Qays and some others.[4] They all opposed Sa'īd Ibn 'Āṣ's remarks, inasmuch as he considered Iraq's lands as belonging to Quraysh. However, after their return to Kūfa, they were led by Mālik, whereupon Mālik hindered Sa'īd from entering Kūfa, Moreover, he himself called Friday prayer. 'Uthmān regarded all these people and their actions as being prompted by 'Alī.[5] 'Āmir Ibn 'Abd Qays who went to 'Uthmān in order to criticize was also sent on exile.[6]

The companions and followers of Kūfa had a key role in the developments of this period. 'Amr Ibn Zurāra Ibn Qays Nakha'ī along with Kumayl Ibn Ziyād and a man from Banū Ṣahbān were reportedly the first who spoke of dethroning 'Uthmān and enthroning the Imām.[7]

Another figure who come to grips with 'Uthmān was 'Ammār Ibn Yāsir. According to Ibn Qutayba and others, a number of companions convened and decided to inform 'Uthmān of his faults through a letter. After the letter

---

[1]. Tārīkh al-ya'qūbī, vol.II, p.173; see al-Futūḥ, vol.II, pp.159-160;Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.V, p.54

[2]. Nath al-durr, vol.II, p.78

[3]. al-Ḥayawān, vol.IV, p.277

[4]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.IV, pp.39 -43

[5]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.V, pp.45-46; Murūdj al-dhahab, vol.II, p.337

[6]. al-Iṣāba, vol.III, p.85

[7]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.V, p.30

was written, 'Ammār was supposed to hand it over to 'Uthmān. But 'Uthmān averted taking the letter.

Thereafter, 'Ammār told him, "This letter is written by number of the companions as an advice to you."

'Uthmān answered, "O the son of Sumayya! You are lying." Whereupon, 'Uthmān ordered him to be sent out of the house through thrashing, with some of his chest ribs broken. After being knocked unconscious, he was dragged out of the house.

Then, Marwān Ibn Ḥakam being the major element behind all stimulations said to 'Uthmān, "If you kill 'Uthmān, you will get rid of others."[1]

One of the impacts of 'Uthmān's thrashing 'Ammār was that 'Ammār was unable to control his urine up to the end of his life.[2] It appears that 'Ammār had been thrashed before Abūdhar has reportedly recalled such a thing in his criticisms.[3]

'Abd Allāh Ibn Mas'ūd was the other opponent. He got the grips with Walid Ibn 'Uqba, the sinful, in Kūfa. Then, through a letter Walīd instigated 'Uthmān against him. In answer to his letter, 'Uthmān called for sending him on exile from Kūfa to Medina. When being in Kūfa, he was deprived of getting his due from the public treasury for a period of three years.[4] Based on the will Ibn Mas'ūd made at the time of death, 'Ammār rather than 'Uthmān was requested to say prayer over his corpse.[5]

To solve the matter with these objections, 'Uthmān assembled the members of his own family and consulted with them. Some of them proposed him to send the companions and other protesters to the outlying battlefields so long as he become free of their criticisms. Some others recommended him to be more benevolent towards people intending to calm them. He along with his family took it for granted that every thing is possible save surrounding to opponents. Mu'āwiya urged 'Uthmān to set

---

[1]. See al-Imāma wa l-siyāsa, vol.I, pp.50-51; al-Futūh, vol.II, pp.153-155; Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.V, p. 49

[2]. Tārikh al-madīnat al-munawwara, vol.III, pp.1099-1100; 'Ammār may have been thrashed once again. See Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.V, p.48

[3]. al-Futūh, vol.II, p.155

[4]. Tārikh al-madīnat al-munawwara, vol. III, p.1049

[5]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.V, pp.31,36,37; Tārikh al-ya'qūbī, vol. II, p. 171; Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, Sharh nahdj al-balāgha, vol.III, pp.42-43. There, 'Abd Allāh's thrashing and his objections of 'Uthmān have been explained in detail.

same former agent to work without paying any attention to the opponents.[1] Once 'Uthmān tried to send a commodity to Abūdhar, yet Abūdhar sent it back.[2] Mu'āwiya also sent some money to Abūdhar in order to deceive him.[3] Furthermore, 'Uthmān sent 30000 drachmae enclosed with some garments to Ibn Abī Ḥudhayfa who was one of the bitter critics of Caliph. Then, 'Alī Ḥudhayfa put the sum of money and the garment in the middle of the mosque saying, O, Muslims! Do you see that 'Uthmān is intending to deceive me in the case of my religion?[4]

'Abd Allāh Ibn 'Āmir also recommended 'Uthmān to satisfy opposers through granting money.[5] Kūfa's ruler, Sa'īd Ibn 'Āṣ, also bade his emissary to send Imām 'Alī (a) a gift and tell him that he is given preference over others in this regard whereupon, Imām got the emissary away through a bitter reaction.[6] 'Uthmān assumed that he should ravish like 'Umar. Thus, he'd rather behave harshly. Unaware of the fact that 'Umar did not lead such a tranquil life like him. So it was this very fact which got in the way of his opponents. 'Uthmān unrightfully believed that 'Umar was not objected by anyone, despite of doing what he did, yet I am objected due to my flexibility.[7] Of course, 'Umar had also some religious innovations, yet, as stated previously he obstructed opponents financially and even behaved very strictly towards all of his agents. Moreover, he did not set his kindreds to work. By all accounts, 'Uthmān was not soft-natured by no means whatsoever, and he had Prophet as well. Once Imām 'Alī (a) objected to 'Uthmān concerning Abūdhar's exiling, caliph said to him, "You yourself are more deserving of exile!"

A noteworthy point in these incidents is that it was not only allowable but also necessary for the companions to protest against the anti-government measures. They resisted the government hardly as long as they and their caliph could survive. This issue labeled as 'Revolt Against Ruler,' later on became a highly momentous issue and drew the attention of all political and religious sects in the world of Islam. It's suitable here to center upon the aforesaid issue.

---

[1]. See al-Futūḥ, vol.II, pp.178-179; Murūdj al-dhahab, vol.II, pp.237-238; Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, vol.II, p.135; al-Bidāya wa l-nihāya vol.VII, p.167; Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.V, p.44

[2]. Lubāb al-adab, p.305

[3]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.V, p.53

[4]. Ibid, vol.V, p.51; vol.II, p.388

[5]. Tārikh al-madīnat al-munawwara, vol.III, p.1095

[6]. Sharḥ mā yaqa' fih l-Taṣḥīf wa l-Taḥrīf, p.107

[7]. Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā, vol.VIII, p.113; al-Bayān wa l-tabyīn, vol.I, p.377

A question of a great significance was, in what case the people can come to oppose their ruler? Or principally, whether or not they have the right to do so. In this respect, much has been mentioned in political opinions of Islamic sects. Besides, the opinions of groups such as Shi'ites Khāridjites and large groups of Mu'tazilites are totally different from the ruling Sunnites. On the whole, what has been reported in this regard, like other issues, derives largely from the objectives realities and political events of the advent of Islam. In this regard, there are two various and, in a sense, contradictory issue which ought to be solved. The first issue is that, if an emir orders against Allāh's Judgment, whether or not people ought to obey him? Based on the known religious principles, if obedience to ruler's order leads to disobedience to Allāh, it will be inadmissible. A narration supports this, The Messenger of Allāh (s) sent 'Abd Allāh Ibn Ḥudhāfa, a humorist, to a tribe under the command of a group. After traversing a short distance, they stopped to rest and kindled a fire.

Then 'Abd Allāh said to them, "Am I not rightful to be obeyed by you?"

They answered, "Yes!"

He further added, "If it is so, you ought to obey whatever I order."

They accepted. Then, he ordered them, "According to my right. I order you to throw yourself into fire." Yet, thereafter he imparted that he was just pulling their leg.

Once the Messenger of Allāh(s) was informed of 'Abd Allāh's attitude, he said, "Don't obey someone who orders you to disobey Allāh."[1]

This was the Messenger of Allāh's conduct which is condensed into the short statement, لا طاعة لمخلوق في معصية الخالق "Where a sin is committed, never ever should a creature be obeyed."

Thereafter, Abū Bakr notified in his first speech that the Messenger was kept infallible through inspiration and he was given care by an angel, yet, to me he seems as a devil who has subdued me occasionally, when I get angry, get away from me ... As long as I obey Allāh and his Messenger, obey me; however, at the time of disobedience to Allāh and his Messenger I am not rightful to be obeyed by you.[2] 'Umar had a harshly daring treatment to the extent that few people had power or courage to oppose him. Anyhow, some people have been reported to oppose him, and in some cases he responded them positively.

---

[1]. Ibn Hishām, al-Sīrat al-nabawiyya, vol.IV, p.640; 'Abd al-Razzāq, al-Muṣannaf, vol.XI, p.335; Ṣaḥīḥ al-bukhārī, Kitāb al-Aḥkām Ḥadīth, vol.IV; Musnad Aḥmad, vol.III, p.67; Mukhtaṣar Tārīkh Dimashq, vol.V p.171; vol.XII, p.104

[2]. 'Abd al-Razzāq, al-Muṣannaf, vol.XI, p.336

Another point lay behind the principle, لا طاعة لمخلوق في معصية الخالق Which was contrary to it.

According to this point, a person's opposition to an emir will pave the way for the disunity of the community or the so-called Congregation. While "the order to maintain congregation" being the most vital principle for solidifying the community is quite contrary to the expression of opposition. Naturally, in non-critical situations, this issue can somewhat be solved through toleration on the part of two parties. However, in case of an unusual circumstance or if the objection gives rise to a critical condition, this issue will be more intricate. In books of Hadith a full section has been devoted to the maintenance of congregation, which is mainly based on obedience to ruler.[1] Of course, it is clear that ruler's benefits lie more in observing the principle of "Congregation" than that of "lack of obedience at the time of disobedience".

'Abd al-Razzāq Ṣan'ānī, in his book entitled as "Muṣannaf" has mentioned some narrations labeled as "the section on the necessity of the community" some of which are to be expounded.

Quoting from the Messenger of Allāh(s), Abū Hurayra said, "The one who dies while he has become separately apart from congregation, and does not obey, indeed he has died in ignorance. The one who has revolted against my people with the sword and strikes good and bad ... he's not among my people. According to Ibn 'Abbās, the one who goes out of obedience by an inch, he has died in ignorance."

It's been quoted that the Messenger of Allāh(s) has ordered five things, compliance, obedience, congregation, immigration and Djihād in the way of Allāh; The one who distances himself from congregation by an inch, he will be no longer a Muslim.

'Umar has also quoted the Prophet(s) as saying, "The one who longs for paradise, maybe maintains the congregation."

Furthermore, he's been quoted as saying, "The one who rebels against any people while they are united intending to divide them, kill him in any possible case."

Ḥudhayfa has reportedly said that the people who tried to downgrade "Allāh's Sultan on earth", should be humiliated by Allāh. Moreover, the Messenger of Allāh(s) has said about the Emirate of the insane people that some emirs will come after me who are not guided by me and do not comply with my Sunna; the one who affirms their lie is helping them with their

---

[1]. See al-Mu'djam al-mufahras Lialfāẓ al-ḥadīth al-nabawī, vol.IV, below the word "Ṭaw'", obedience

oppression, so we are not from each other and he won't come on me in the Pond of Abundance (Kawthar).

In another hadith he said, "Nothing is better than speaking in justice before a tyrant Sultan. Avoiding people should not hinder you from speaking in truth."

The narrator of this hadith, Abū Sa'īd Khudrī, after narrating it, burst into tears and said, "By God! We refrained from so doing."

One day Abūdhar came to 'Uthmān and found fault with him. Thereafter, while reclining on stick 'Alī (a) joined them.

'Uthmān asked, "What should I do with him?"

'Alī (a) answered, "Allāh has said about him that, if he be a liar, on him will be his lie, and if he be truthful, there will befall you some of that which he threatens you with (The Believer, (Ghāfir) 28)."

Then 'Uthmān said to 'Alī (a), "Keep quiet, woe back onto you! You asked me something and I answered you."[1]

'Abd Allāh Ibn Mas'ūd has also quoted the Messenger of Allāh(s) as saying to him, "What do you do while seeing emirs who do not comply with my Sunna and never say prayer on time."

Ibn Mas'ūd answered, "I asked what to do?"

Then, the Messenger of Allāh(s) said, "You are asking me what to do!" لا طاعة لمخلوق في معصية الله[2]

In continuation of this narration and before that numerous narrations have been mentioned concerning these emirs who never say prayer on time. Once seeing that Walīd Ibn 'Uqba has refrained from timely prayer, Ibn Mas'ūd requested Mu'adhdhin to recite Adhān.

Then, he himself began to say prayer. Thereafter, answering to Walīd's objection, he said, "Allāh and His Messenger do not accept us to wait for you while you are going about your business."[3]

Some Scholar as Ḥasan Baṣrī, Zuhrī and Qatāda has reportedly said prayer alongside emirs, even if these emirs did not do it on its due time.[4] Concerning 'Uthmān, it's been stated that Ḥasan Baṣrī was questioned in this way, who did say prayer after sermon (in feast of prayer)?

---

[1]. 'Abd al-Razzāq, al-Muṣannaf, vol.XI, pp.339-349

[2]. Ibid, vol.II, p.384

[3]. 'Abd al-Razzāq, al-Muṣannaf, vol.II, p.384

[4]. Ibid, vol.II, p.385; Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā, vol.VII, p.402

He answered, "'Uthmān always says prayer at the outset and then he makes a sermon." However, seeing that many people do not stay for sermon, he decided to make sermon at first and say prayer thereafter.[1]

These were samples of narrations quoted by 'Abd al-Razzāq Ṣan'ānī in this regard. It should be said, however, that opposition to bid for disobedience was once considered as prescription of criticism and the other time as revolt. The second not the first is more momentous concerning separation of community. Many issues are available as regards 'Uthmān as well as historical experience of his caliphate, e.g. for him, opposition and criticism were beyond endurance. Once in 26 A.H, 'Uthmān merged some neighboring houses together to develop the sacred Mosque and tried to sponsor for it by public treasury, some people burst into objection.

Hence, ordering to imprison them, 'Uthmān said, "What dared you stand against me is your forbearance; otherwise, 'Umar himself did so."

Eventually, prisoners were all released under the mediation of 'Abd Allāh Ibn Khālid Ibn Usayd.[2] However, having remembered the prior conduct in which any criticism was permissible, the comparisons and the followers criticized 'Uthmān whenever the ground was prepared. He resisted these objections and never surrendered to them, in cases of a sever pressure-due to the siege of his house-he admitted objections temporarily, yet, as soon as the pressure was removed he acted cruelly.

At the time when Imām 'Alī (a) was accompanying Abūdhar, 'Uthmān said, "Didn't you hear that I ordered not to accompany Abūdhar?"

Then, Imām answered, "Must we obey your orders, while we find them contrary to Allāh's Judgment? By Allāh, we don't do so."

'Uthmān became angry with Imām 'Alī (a) and told him that Marwān has been given superiority over him. The next day, 'Uthmān went to Muhādjirūn and Anṣār so as to grumble about Imām 'Alī (a). He noted that 'Alī finds faults with him and supports those raising difficulty, that is, 'Ammār, Abūdhar and others. Thereafter, people brought about a compromise between 'Alī (a) and 'Uthmān, and 'Alī (a) stated that his accompanying of Abūdhar had been merely for the sake of Allāh.[3]

Marwān Ibn Ḥakam says, "In midway of Mecca and Medina, I witnessed the contact between 'Alī and 'Uthmān, in which 'Uthmān banned performing lesser pilgrimage in Ḥadjdj months (or both lesser and greater pilgrimage)."

---

[1]. Tārīkh al-madīnat al-munawwara, vol.II, p.385; Musnad Abī Dāwūd, vol.I, p.297

[2]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.IV, p.259

[3]. Murūdj al-dhahab, vol.II, pp.341-342; Tārīkh al-ya'qūbī, vol.II, p.173

Seeing such a thing, 'Alī (a) said, "I become clothed in a pilgrimage state, then he said Labbayk for both of them."

'Uthmān objected to him asking, "Are you doing what I forbid?"

Imām answered, "I do not give up the Sunna of the Messenger(s) on behalf of anybody."[1]

Ibn Mas'ūd was also one of the tenacious dissenters of 'Uthmān. He was some time among those who said, "If 'Uthmān says a four rak'at-prayer rather than a two rak'at one in Minā, he is to be obeyed, since opposition is considered as an evil.[2]

Elsewhere he has said, "'Uthmān is Imām, so I do not oppose him, for opposition is considered as an evil."[3] Though, later on he acted so intensely against 'Uthmān.[4]

A large number of companions were unanimous in opposition to 'Uthmān. Later, the Sunnis disbelieved the companions under the auspices of disagreeing with the ruler as legitimate political conduct and mainly pretended that a bunch of rascals rose in revolt against 'Uthmān. 'Uthmān was objected by Imām 'Alī (a) when he said a four rak'at-prayer in 29 A.H. in Minā, because it was contrary to the Messenger(s) and former caliphs' conducts.

In answer to Imām presenting the Messenger(s)'s conduct, 'Uthmān said,"This is what I believed in."[5]

'Uthmān's despotism established a modern process in the course of despotism in caliphate organizations. Anyway, due to the relative strength of Islamic values in the community, 'Uthmān with all his importunity could not suppress the oppositions; on the contrary, he was removed by increasingly growing opposition. This was a new experience for the history of Islamic caliphate which became later on an essential theoretical issue in Islamic political jurisprudence.

---

[1]. Tārīkh al-madīnat al-munawwara, vol.II, pp.1043-1044

[2]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.IV, p.268; al-Ghadīr, vol.VIII, p.99, quoted from, Sunan Abī Dāwūd, vol.I, p.308; Qāḍī Abū Yūsuf, al-Āthār, p.30; Shāfi'ī, Kitāb al-Umm, vol.I, p.159; vol.VII, p.175; Biyhaqī, Sunnan al-kubrā, vol.III, p.144

[3]. Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, vol.III, p.42

[4]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.IV, pp.524 -527; Tārīkh al-madīnat al-munawwara, vol.II, pp.1049-1054

[5]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.IV, p.267

'UTHMĀN AND MU'ĀWIYA

Damascus gained victory with the help of Abū 'Ubayda Djarrāḥ, Khālid Ibn Walīd and Yazīd Ibn Abī Sufyān. After extinction of this genwration, 'Umar left their legacy to Mu'āwiya from that time on Mu'āwiya thought of caliphate. When 'Uthmān was enthroned, Mu'āwiya's position became thoroughly firm. He intended to bring 'Uthmān to Syria in a tumult of anti-'Uthmān objections so as to settle every thing fine for himself. However, 'Uthmān rejected him.[1] Anyway, with regard to 'Uthmān's policies in employing the Umayya, it seems unlikely for caliph himself to be unmindful of this tendency that caliphate should remain in the Umayya.

Anti-'Uthmān revolt was equivocal for Mu'āwiya. What should he have done against the companions of the prophet(s)? He opted to neglect 'Uthmān's repeated invitations, his humble requests for support and the dispatch of troops as well as wait for the consequence of domestic quarrel between 'Uthmān and the companions. Put it another way, if 'Uthmān reinstated, Mu'āwiya could come on power once more, however, 'Uthmān's killing would pave the way for a domestic war in which Mu'āwiya hoped for victory, that is, a war waged under the pretext of vengeance on 'Uthmān. It was currently quite clear to many companions that Mu'āwiya looked forward to 'Uthmān's killing. Realizing this very fact, though 'Uthmān was unable to resolve it seriously. As soon as 'Uthmān was killed, his dress was sent to Mu'āwiya by his wife, Nā'ila.[2]

Meanwhile, Mu'āwiya started his efforts to stupefy Syrians against Medinans and the companions of the Prophet(s). He further determined to marry 'Uthmān's wife to himself in order to revenge himself on 'Uthmān more readily. Anyhow, 'Uthmān's wife refused such a thing, and even she broke her teeth to dissuade Mu'āwiya.[3]

According to Ya'qūbī, 'Uthmān when under siege wrote letters to Mu'āwiya over and over to request help, yet Mu'āwiya refrained from dispatching troops. This negligence was to such an extent that 'Uthmān realized the fact of the matter. In last days, Mu'āwiya launched 1200 soldiers to Syria and notified their commander to stay over there until they are ordered. In the meantime, he sent someone to 'Uthmān; seeing Mu'āwiya's emissary, 'Uthmān asked, "Have you got any help?"

The emissary replied, "I've come to become aware of your situation."

---

[1]. al-Kāmil fī l-tārikh, vol.III, p.157

[2]. Balādhurī has been quoted as saying, Umm Ḥabība, Mu'āwiya's sister and the Prophet(s)'s wife, had brought this bloody dress. See Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.II, p.291

[3]. Nathr al-durr, vol.IV, p.62; Balāghāt al-nisā', p.139; al-'Iqd al-farīd, vol.VI, p.90

'Uthmān said, "No, you've come here in order to kill me."[1]

After some days, Syrians were informed of 'Uthmān's killing, so an army was turned back to Syria. Based on Djuwayriyya, following 'Uthmān's asking for help, Mu'āwiya dispatched an army and declared their commander to stay at Dhī Khushub. They stayed there till 'Uthmān was killed. Djuwayriyya says that Mu'āwiya deliberately did so in order for 'Uthmān to be killed.[2]

Imām 'Alī (a) wrote to Mu'āwiya, "You came to 'Uthmān's assistance when it was for the benefit of yourself, and humiliated him when it brought about your victory."[3] And in another letter it was written, "Did I kill 'Uthmān or you? Since I helped him in any case, while you neglected helping him, despite his request for help, until you heard of his killing."[4]

According to another letter by Imām to Mu'āwiya, "By Allāh! O Mu'āwiya! No one but you killed 'Uthmān and downgraded him."[5]

Abū Ṭufayl also said to Mu'āwiya, "Why didn't you stand by 'Uthmān while people were along with you?"[6]

In Ṣiffīn, Abū Ayyūb Anṣārī wrote a letter to Mu'āwiya as an answer to his blaming of Anṣār for 'Uthmān's killing saying, "He was killed by Yazīd Ibn Asad whom you sent in an attempt to back 'Uthmān, yet he being stopped in his way, wasn't of any help to 'Uthmān."[7] In fact, the aforementioned person was ordered by Mu'āwiya not to go over there.

In a letter to Mu'āwiya, Shabath Ibn Rib'ī accused him of failing to support 'Uthmān saying, "You liked 'Uthmān to be killed, for his killing would give you an excuse."[8]

Ibn 'Abbās also wrote a letter to 'Uthmān saying, "You were interested in killing 'Uthmān."[9]

---

[1]. Tārīkh al-ya'qūbī, vol.II, p.165

[2]. Tārīkh al-madīnat al-munawwara, vol.III, p.1289

[3]. Nahdj al-sa'āda, vol.IV, p.169; Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, vol.IV, p.57; al-Ḥayāt al-siyāsiya li l-Imām al-Ḥasan(a), p.146, from, al-Naṣāyiḥ al-kāfiya, p.20; Buḥrānī, Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, vol.V, p.81

[4]. Nahdj al-balāgha, letter 28

[5]. Nahdj al-sa'āda, vol.IV, p.212

[6]. al-Muwaffaqiyyāt, p.154; al-Ḥayāt al-siyāsiya li l-Imām al-Ḥasan(a), p.147, from, various sources.

[7]. Waq'at Ṣiffīn, p.368; al-Imāma wa l-siyāsa, vol.I, p.131; Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, Sharḥ Nahdj al-balāgha, vol.VIII, p.44; al-Ghadīr, vol.IX, p.151

[8]. Waq'at Ṣiffīn, p.187; al-Ghadīr, vol.IX, p.151; Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol. III, p.270

[9]. Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, vol.XVI, p.155

Afterwards, being accused by Yazīd of implication in the assassination of ʻUthmān Ibn ʻAbbās answered, " I did not play any role in this event; however, it was your father who neglected to support him and prevented his troops from helping him when requested."[1]

Shahristānī says, "In essence, all Muʻāwiya's agents in different cities avoided helping him.[2] Letters by different persons are pieces of evidence for this matter.[3]

Muʻāwiya says, "I myself feel sorry for (about) not helping ʻUthmān when demanded."[4]

ʻAmr Ibn ʻĀṣ also induced Muʻāwiya for disgracing ʻUthmān through failing to support him.[5] Coming together in Baṣra, Djamal companions remembered to go to Syria and joined Muʻāwiya. However, they became frightened of Muʻāwiya's failure to help ʻUthmān when requested, accordingly they didn't go to Syria. The last point in this regard is that ʻAbd Allāh Ibn Saʻīd Ibn Abī Sarḥ, ʻUthmān's killing and resided over there, since he was unwilling to be alongside ʻUthmān. According to him, he hated to be along with a man (Muʻāwiya) who liked ʻUthmān to be killed.[6]

IMĀM ʻALĪ (A) AND ʻUTHMĀN

After Imām ʻAlī was withdrawn with power in Saqīfa; besides, Imām's efforts to bring power back came to a deadlock, he tried to maintain roots and branches of Islam as well as to keep down through his own religious knowledge. Meanwhile, he remembered his forgotten right in every appropriate atmosphere. The second caliph in spite of strictly employing his opponents attempted to solve judicial and in some cases political problems by using Imām's scientific ability. Some examples of caliph's consultation with Imām were previously mentioned. There are numerous narrations in sources concerning judicial problems, some of which are compiled by ʻAllāma Amīnī in the sixth version of al-Ghadīr under the title of "Nawādir al-Athar fī ʻIlm ʻUmar". In this regard, a scripture is in hand showing ʻUmar's emphasis in judicial issue on acting Imām's orders.[7]

---

[1]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.IV, p.19

[2]. al-Milal wa l-niḥal, vol.I, p.26

[3]. al-Ghadīr, vol.IX, pp.149-150; vol.X, p.333; Tārīkh al-yaʻqūbī, vol.II, p.223; al-ʻIqd al-farīd, vol. IV, p. 334; Tadhkirat al-khawāṣ, pp.85,201; al-Futūḥ, vol.II, p.353

[4]. al-Futūḥ, vol.II, p.287

[5]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.II, p.287

[6]. al-Maʼrifa wa l-tārīkh, vol. I, p.254; Tārīkh al-madīnat al-munawwara, vol.III, p.1153

[7]. Sayyid Raḍī, al-khaṣāʼiṣ, p.59

In this respect, 'Uthmān's pride was so much so that we can hardly find any model for it in 'Umar's time. Previous enmities of the Umayyads and Hāshimites together with Badr, Uḥud and killers of the Umayyads might have been influential in this case. Especially, 'Uthmān's enthroning was just followed by removal of Imām 'Alī. 'Uthmān's distraction from the proper way and Imām's insistence on defending right caused 'Uthmān to be more hostile towards Imām 'Alī (a).

Once 'Uthmān determined to exile 'Ammār, yet being objected by Imām, he answered, "You yourself are more deserving of exile!"[1] There are other examples of 'Uthmān's bitter treatment with Imām in sources.[2] According to Sa'īd Ibn Musayyib, "I witnessed that a verbal clash occurred between 'Alī and 'Uthmān. 'Uthmān held up the lash to knock 'Alī, but I hindered."[3] It's been repeatedly quoted that 'Uthmān would have objected Imām before 'Abbās.[4] Imām's resistance to 'Uthmān's wrong response induced 'Uthmān to object Imām's saying, انك لكثير الخلاف علينا[5] "You put yourself in trouble for us again."

Imām Sadjdjād quoted Marwān as saying, "I saw 'Uthmān in the pilgrimage banning from performing the lesser pilgrimage in pilgrimage days. Consequently, such a thing caused Imām 'Alī to become clothed in pilgrim garment for both lesser and greater pilgrimage.

'Uthmān said, "There you do again while I'm forbidding."

Imām replied, "I do not desist from the Messenger(s)'s Sunna for the sake of anyone."[6] Apparently, the political conditions of 'Uthmān's time gave rise to more public criticisms. Perhaps, public accompaniment with these criticizing movements is one main reason. When Walīd Ibn 'Uqba was brought to Medina to be punished, Imām allowing no one to punish him threw him on the ground, thereafter facing 'Uthmān's objection to his very action Imām began to punish 'Uthmān in Walīd's stead.[7] It can be found out from the whole events of anti-'Uthmān revolts that opponents, for the most part, supported Imām in his candidacy for caliphate. Although some of them such as 'Amr Ibn 'Āṣ, Ṭalḥa and Zubayr were not willing to do so, Imām's influence over opponents induced 'Uthmān to take a dual line against him. On one part, 'Uthmān believed Imām to be the major motive behind these

---

1. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol. V, pp. 54 -55
2. al-Kāmil fi l-adab, vol I, p. 22
3. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol. II, p. 132
4. al-Muwaffaqiyyāt, p. 611; 'Uyūn al-akhbār, vol. III, p. 92
5. Musnad Aḥmad, vol. I, p. 100
6. Tārikh al-madīnat al-munawwara, vol. III, p. 1043
7. Tārīkh al-ya'qūbī, vol. II, p. 165; Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol. V, p. 33

incidents; on the other part, he having no alternative asked Imām to mediate and calm opponents, in so far as they listened to him.[1] According to some accounts, Imām was recognized as "the spokesman of opponents".[2] Anyway, this fact neither meant that they were totally under the control of Imām, nor did it mean that Imām was for all their actions. The key question to be posed here is concerning Imām's opinion on 'Uthmān. It should be taken into account that Imām living among people who killed 'Uthmān couldn't speak freely.

Regarding Imām's political opinion, it can simply be said that neither was Imām for 'Uthmān's killing, nor did he deem his killing advisable. Due to realizing that this was not but an action for Mu'āwiya's benefit, Imām tried to prevent from 'Uthmān's killing in any case. Even, at the outset, he made effort to reconciliate people with him and suppress the revolt. Once he said about his political supports, I backed 'Uthmān to such an extent that I am afraid of committing any sin in this regard.[3] Later on he said that you killed 'Uthmān while I was in my house.[4]

It's better, though, to make a distinction between Imām's "religious view" and "political view". It's likely that Imām believed 'Uthmān to be deserving of such a treatment by people due to making deliberate errors regarding Islam and its rules together with destructing the circumstances of the community, although it's impossible to comment precisely on this case. Yet some interpretations are possibly put on Imām's explanations in this regard. Imām was once asked whether he implicated in killing 'Uthmān or not. He replied, Allāh killed 'Uthmān and I'm with Allāh.[5]

He further said, "Neither I liked 'Uthmān to be killed, nor did I loathe his killing."[6] He also added, I am neither happy nor sad about 'Uthmān's killing.[7]

Elsewhere Imām called 'Uthmān "the element of all wrongdoers".[8] When he was asked whether 'Uthmān was killed in an oppressed manner or not, Imām answered, He sacrificed himself to the people of house in a very

---

[1]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol. V, p. 61

[2]. Ibid, p. V, p. 26

[3]. Ṣubḥī, Nahdj al-balāgha, p. 358

[4]. al-Djamal, p. 417

[5]. 'Uyūn al-akhbār, vol. II, p. 207

[6]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol. V, p. 101; Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā, vol. III, p. 82

[7]. al-Ghadīr, vol. IX, p. 29; Tārikh al-madīnat al-munawwara, vol. III, p. 12633 ما امرت ولانهيت ولاسرني ولا ساءني قتل عثمان I neither ordered nor hindered anyone, he neither respected me nor did wrong to me.

[8]. al-Muwaffaqiyyāt, vol. XIII; Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, vol. IX, p. 17

bad manner, and you treated him very badly.[1] Imām wrote to Kūfiyāns about his contact with 'Uthmān, Now, I am appraising you of what befell 'Uthmān so (correctly) that its hearing maybe like its seeing. People criticized him, and I was the only man from among the Muhādjirūn who asked him to seek to satisfy (the Muslims) the most and to offend them the least; Furthermore, Ṭalḥa and Zubayr rushed, teased and debilitated 'Uthmān very easily. Then, 'Āyisha who was in a rage with him appeared as well and vented her wrath on him, in so doing she gave people an opportunity to overpower and kill him.[2]

At the time when being selected as an ambassador by people, Imām said to 'Uthmān, "People are behind me and they have made me an ambassador between you and themselves. But by Allāh! I do not know what to say. I know nothing (in this matter) which you do not know, nor can I lead you to any matter of which you are not aware .... You should not behave as the carrying beast for Marwān so that he may drag you wherever he likes, despite your seniority of age and length of life." 'Uthmān answered, "Don't ask people to grant me respite in order that I can compensate for my oppressive treatment towards them."

Whereupon Imām said, "So far as Medina is concerned here is no question of time. As for remoter areas you can have the time needed for your order to reach there."[3]

According to historians,[4] Imām considered Marwān as the major factor behind these movements.[5] Anyway, Imām was opposed to the murder of 'Uthmān, primarily due to the dominance of people over their ruler which was, in itself, followed by a brawl. Inasmuch as it's a tremendously risky task to have the mere feeling that it's very simple to kill every ruler. Muslims recently heard of Sassanids' experience concerning reigning of some kings in about several years and their immediate killing. Hence, 'Abd Allāh Ibn 'Umar warned them, "Are you doing it heraclitusly, killing any king whenever growing angry with him?"

The selection of Imām by Medinans, those who entered Medina and some who played a crucial role in anti-'Uthmān revolt induced the Umayyads to accuse Imām of killing 'Uthmān. 'Amr Ibn Ḥamiq Khuzā'ī assuming to be one of the four who attacked 'Uthmān's house was ranked

---

[1]. Nathr al-durr, vol. I, p. 274; al-Aghānī, vol. VI, p. 233; 'Abd, Nahdj al-balāgha, sermon 27

[2]. Nahdj al-balāgha, letter 1

[3]. Nahdj al-balāgha, sermon 164

[4]. al-Fakhrī, p. 98

[5]. Nahdj al-sa'āda, vol. IV, p. 27

among the pure Shi'ite Muslims.[1] The same is true with Muḥammad Ibn Abī Bakr. Likewise, once 'Uthmān's house was under siege, Imām said feast prayer. And when 'Uthmān came in power, initially he said prayers and then he made sermon just like before. Yet, noting that people leave great mosque after sermon, he decided to make sermon at the outset, and say prayer in the end.[2] However, while saying feast prayer, Imām said prayer firstly and made sermon secondly.[3] It appears that Imām has said feast prayer without 'Uthmān's permission. Anyway, 'Uthmān had confessed that he prefers 'Alī to take charge rather than any body else.[4] When 'Uthmān's house was under siege, Sahl Ibn Ḥunayf said congregational prayer, perhaps by 'Uthmān's permission.[5] Imām was accused due to his presence in Medina in these circumstances. Thus, it's been said that Usāma insisted on Imām's going to Mecca or Yanbu'.[6] Of course, in as much as Imām was a crucial factor for coping with the situations, his leaving of Medina did not seem to be reasonable.

Imām repeatedly rejected the blame for 'Uthmān's killing attributed to him, anyhow, 'Uthmānids' propagation was to the extent that it occasioned Djamal and Ṣiffīn. Walīd Ibn 'Uqba, the wrongdoer, addressed Banū Hāshim in a poem, هم قتلوه حتى يكونوا مكانه "Banū Hāshim killed 'Uthmān so as to take his place."[7]

He further said, "Walīd had the most hostile manner towards Imām"; moreover, according to Naṣr Ibn Muzāḥim's poems, Walīd instigated Mu'āwiya to wage a war against Imām 'Alī (a). this apart from his father's murder in Badr was due to enforcing punishment of drinking on him by Imām in front of people and 'Uthmān.[8] 'Uthmān himself put the blame on Imām, on account of opponents' attention to him. He has even revealed ironically in his poem that he is looking forward to Imām's killing.[9] This was suggested to him by Marwān Ibn Ḥakam, the sinner, the evildoer. Marwān has been quoted as saying to people, "At the outset, a handful of

---

[1]. Usd al-ghāba, vol. IV, p. 100. he was martyred by Mu'āwiya's agents in 50 A.H. and his head was sent to Syria. His tomb was made by Ḥamdāniyān in Mūṣil. Thereafter, an ample clash befell between Shi'ite Muslims and 'Uthmānids.

[2]. Musnad Abī Dāwūd, vol. I, p. 297; Tārikh al-madīnat al-munawwara, vol. III, p. 964

[3]. Tārikh al-madīnat al-munawwara, vol. III, p. 1216

[4]. Ibid, vol. III, p. 1206

[5]. Ibid, vol. III, p. 1218

[6]. Ibid, vol. III, p. 1211

[7]. al-Kāmil fi l-adab, vol. III, p. 38; Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol. V, p. 104

[8]. al-Futūḥ, vol. II, p. 350

[9]. Nathr al-durr, vol. I, p. 63; Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol. V, p. 62

people came from Egypt, yet they were ordered to come back and assemble a large multitude."[1]

Imām repeatedly refused to have any role in 'Uthmān's murder saying, "If I know that the Umayyads believe something through swearing, I would swear to the Black Stone and the status of Ibrāhīm that I did not kill 'Uthmān."[2]

Imām wrote to Mu'āwiya, "If one judges me, he will certainly imagine that I am the purest man."[3]

He further said, "I did not kill 'Uthmān, nor did I order to kill him."[4]

Verily, Ibn Sīrīn said, "'Alī was accused of 'Uthmān's assassination while being selected as caliph."[5] Ibn Shubba has allocated a full chapter to Imām's statements concerning his refusal of any implication in killing 'Uthmān.[6]

It seems interesting to note that despite all these remarks, 'Uthmān sought assistance just from Imām and no one else.[7] Typically, when 'Uthmān was stopped having water by Ṭalḥa, he asked Imām for help. Accordingly, Imām came to Ṭalḥa and requested him to let water into 'Uthmān's house. Then, he got his son to take a bowl of water to 'Uthmān.[8] Afterwards, in Karbalā Ibn Ziyād ordered not to let Imām Ḥusayn drink any water, as regards 'Uthmān was stopped having water when under siege. Under these circumstances in which no one was able to help 'Uthmān, nor did he dare to do so, it was Imām who came to his assistance. Ibn Shubba has labeled a chapter as 'Uthmān's asking Imām 'Alī for help.[9] Another good-to-know note is that Mālik, as one of the extreme adherents of Imām, attempted to release 'Uthmān from (being under) siege with the help of Hūdadj Umm Ḥabība, while his house was under siege.[10] Though, not being allowed to enter the house by the besiegers, he seemingly intended to save him from the besiegers in secret. The final word of Ibn Shubba in his chapter is that, in Ṣiffīn, Imām did not accept in the presence of 'Uthmān's

---

1. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol. V, p. 89
2. Ibid, vol. V, p. 81
3. Waq'at Ṣiffīn, p. 29
4. Ibn Abī Shayba, al-Muṣannaf, vol. XV, p. 228; see Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol. V, p. 100
5. Ibn Abī Shayba, al-Muṣannaf, vol. XV, p. 229
6. Tārikh al-madīnat al-munawwara, vol. III, p. 1285
7. Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā, vol. III, p. 82; Rabi' al-abrār, vol. I, p. 415
8. Tārikh al-madīnat al-munawwara, vol. III, p. 1202
9. Ibid, vol. III, pp. 1219-1223
10. Ibid, vol. III, p. 1313

representatives that 'Uthmān has been killed oppressively.[1] Consequently, his very statement meant that Imām seems to be guilty at any rate.

ASSASSINATION OF 'UTHMĀN

As objections against 'Uthmān were gradually intensified, some men explicitly used to stand up before 'Uthmān in mosque and object to him. 'Uthmān was obliged to use violence so as to calm them and this, in turn, would lead to more clash on the part of them. To 'Urwa Ibn Zubayr, I witnessed that 'Uthmān entered the mosque. Some people surrounded him and called him Na'thal, old stupid man. Then, 'Uthmān went up the pulpit and began to speak. Djahdjāh Ibn Sa'd Ghifārī who was among those who swore allegiance to his family began to object. At the same time, the circumstances turned in a way that 'Uthmān could not continue to speak, so he came down the pulpit and Sahl Ibn Ḥunayf said Friday prayer on that day.[2] Once objections against 'Uthmān heightened, some Kūfiyāns and Egyptians departed for Medina at the request of the companions alongside in protest against the Umayya rulers of these cities. This crowd was beaded by 'Abd al-Raḥmān Ibn 'Udays Balawī who was among those who swore allegiance to his family,[3]together with Muḥammad Ibn Abī Ḥudhayfa. Ibn Shubba also carried a letter written by the Egyptians to 'Uthmān prior to going to Medina. They notified the necessity for implementing the divine orders with regard to the Qur'ānic verses saying, You are claimant for being rightful to be obeyed by us, whereas based on Qur'ān, obedience to the one who disobeys Allāh is not permissible. If you obey Allāh, in consequence, we'll soon find out that you have it in mind to perish yourself along with.[4] 'Uthmān sent 'Ammār there in order to calm the Egyptians. However, he was unaware that 'Ammār himself after being sent to Egypt instigated people against 'Uthmān. In the wake of 'Ammār's driving out, some people reckoned to be about 400 to 700 came into Medina. This group visited 'Uthmān and his representative and set forth their demands as follows. Firstly, to return on-exile persons. Secondly, to pay the deprived's rights. Thirdly, to act upon Qur'ān and the deprived's rights. 'Uthmān repented officially towards them and warned them to avert disunity.[5] In terms of 'Uthmān's agreements, a mutual treaty was written between 'Uthmān and Imām 'Alī who was made as an ambassador between people and caliph. Five

---

[1]. Waq'at Ṣiffīn, pp. 201-202

[2]. Tārikh al-madīnat al-munawwara, vol. III, p. 1111

[3]. Ibid, vol. III, p. 1155

[4]. Ibid, vol. III, p. 1121

[5]. Ibid, vol. III, pp. 1135-1137

clauses were laid out in this very treaty, among which three have been mentioned above, and the forth one is to observe justice in distributing and employing people who are worthy and strong enough to manage the affairs. Then, a number of the companions attested to this treaty.[1] This very action resulted in the Egyptians' return.

Another cultural city for opponents was Kūfa. Sa'd Ibn 'Āṣ wrote to 'Uthmān saying that some people who call themselves "readers" and are indeed stupid have thrashed my chief-police and thereby looked down on me.

'Uthmān answered, "Send them to Syria in order that they might fight a war."

After being sent to Syria, they got to grips with Mu'āwiya. Hence, this induced Mu'āwiya to send them to Ḥimṣ. Yet, after a while since Sa'd Ibn 'Āṣ was sent away from Kūfa by people, they came back to Kūfa. It was then the Kūfiyāns enumerated 'Uthmāns' mistakes through a letter. This very letter together with the Egyptians' letter is an indicative of the extent to which people made effort to shed light on caliph's mind not withstanding that 'Uthmān never catch on the fact. The Kūfiyāns' letter was brought to Medina by Abū Rabi' at al-'Anzī. Thereafter through a letter by 'Uthmān, Sa'd was ordered to give him twenty lashes and exile him to Damāwand mount.[2] Once the Egyptians returned to their own city, they met a horsman called Yuḥanna and was 'Uthmān's slave who was riding rapidly to Egypt, they hold him and grabbed a letter from him. The letter had been sealed by 'Uthmān and addressed to 'Abd Allāh Ibn Sa'd. as a matter of fact, he was ordered by 'Uthmān to kill some protesters and put some others into prison and ... This provoked protesters to return to Medina angrily. After coming back to Medina, first of all they went to Imām 'Alī (a) who was the mediator of peace. Imām took their letter to 'Uthmān. But 'Uthmān swore that he has not written the letters; besides, he is kept uninformed of it. It is interesting to mention that the Umayyads and even 'Uthmān himself blamed Imām by stating, He has written the letter so as to incite the people against caliph.[3] Word came that the Egyptians have Kūfa and 100 people from Baṣra came to Medina and besieged 'Uthmān.

As Zuhrī states, "I asked Sa'd Ibn Musayyib, How was 'Uthmān killed and why did the companions downgrade him?"

He replied, "Once 'Uthmān was in power, a discontent befell some of the companions, for he liked his own family, typically, he set an abundance

---

[1]. Tārikh al-madīnat al-munawwara, pp. 1137-1140

[2]. Ibid, vol. III, pp. 1142-1143

[3]. Ibid, vol. III, pp. 1150-1151, 1155

of those who were not reckoned among the companions to work." In consequence, his action gave rise to a hatred among the companions. In the second six-year term of caliphate, 'Uthmān got the Umayya to take control of affairs; furthermore, he appointed 'Abd Allāh Ibn Sa'd to Egypt. Yet, the latter created an obligation on the part of the Egyptians. As a matter of fact, prior to this, 'Uthmān had also some contacts with 'Abd Allāh Ibn Mas'ūd, Abūdhar and 'Ammār which resulted in discontent on part of their tribes. Then, the Egyptians arrived in Medina. Imām 'Alī (a) acted as an intermediary between them, thus it was determined that another figure will take the position of 'Abd Allāh Ibn Sa'd, namely Muḥammad Ibn Abī Bakr. 'Uthmān signed for his sainthood and then they left the place. They met a horseman on the way who was carrying a letter concerning caliph's bitter instruction to 'Abd Allāh Ibn Sa'd. it was then all the protesters returned to Medina angrily. Then, all the Medinans vented their wrath on 'Uthmān; moreover, as for the people, public complex concerning what befell 'Ammār, Abūdhar and 'Abd Allāh Ibn Mas'ūd developed. Imām 'Alī along with a number of people went to 'Uthmān. The handwriting indicated that the letter had been written by Marwān. Then, the protesters asked 'Uthmān to hand over Marwān who is ordering to carnage so dauntlessly. However, 'Uthmān avoided doing so. This very action caused people to besiege 'Uthmān and shop him having water.[1]

A noteworthy point is that dissenters did not think of caliph's assassination from the beginning. Rather, in the list stage they pled him to be dethroned. However, 'Uthmān refused to be dethroned. It was the first time that caliph's dethronement was spoken. The caliph, in what case, can dethrone himself or do the others have the right to do so? Such an issue was repeatedly posed during the caliphate history. But historically it was first raised when rebels asked 'Uthmān to dethrone. 'Uthmān, in response to their suggestion, said that God has granted caliphate to him and he is not willing to abdicate.

Quoting him, the Messenger(s) said to him, "O 'Uthmān! God will put a garment on you and hypocrites of dethronement will ask you for it, don't take it off until you join me."[2]

This hadith is definitely a forged one and ascribed to 'Uthmān and the Messenger(s). But 'Uthmān, in essence, believed that caliphate is garment God put him on and he is not willing to take it off. Such a thing indicated that 'Uthmān, by linking Caliphate to God, intends to deny public vole and their decision upon his dethronement.

---

[1]. Tārīkh al-madīnat al-munawwara, vol.III, pp.1159-1161; Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, vol.I, p.229; al-Ghadīr, vol. IX, p.180.

[2]. al-Imāma wa l-siyāsa, vol. I, p. 61 Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā, vol. III, p. 66

When 'Uthmān was suggested dethronement, he said, "Even if I'm beheaded, I'll never abdicate."[1]

'Abd Allāh Ibn 'Umar said, "He asked me in the time of 'Uthmān's siege, "What do you think of Mughīra Ibn Ākhnas's suggestion?"

He said, "They want you to dethrone unless you'll be murdered so you should leave it to them."

'Abd Allāh Ibn 'Umar said, "I told 'Uthmān, is there anything more important than your murder unless you dethrone?"

He replied, "No."

I said, "To me, you'd better not include such an innovation in Islam that every time a group of rebels revolt in an aim to dethrone their emir; don't take the garment of God has put you on!" [2]

Some who laid siege are heard to say that we just intend to dethrone him not to murder him; 'Uthmān said, "Not my dethronement but my murder."[3]

When Egyptian opponents, on their way back, found 'Uthmān's letter to 'Abd Allāh Ibn Sa'd, in which he was ordered to bother, annoy and murder opposes, they turned back to Medina. 'Uthmān said that the letter writer was not him and then the fact that the main culpable was Marwān Ibn Ḥakam was cleared up. He was asked by the opponents to dethrone due to his incapability in government administration, but he rejected. [4]

Muḥammad Ibn Abī Bakr, later on, confirmed, "We wanted him to dethrone but he rejected." [5]

According to another narration, 'Uthmān sent for Mālik Ashtar and asked him, "What do people want me?"

Mālik said, "One of the two things, either to dethrone yourself and leave the caliphate for people or to retaliate yourself maybe it refers to the retaliation of annoyance done to Ibn Mas'ūd, 'Ammār and others; otherwise, you'll be fighted."

'Uthmān said, "I shan't take the garment off God put me on. Abū Bakr and 'Umar were doing chastisement concerning retaliation and such a thing didn't exist. But in the case of my murder, you'll be in a lot of trouble."[1]

---

[1]. Tārikh khalīfat Ibn khayyāṭ, p. 170, see Tārikh al-islām, 'Ahd al-khulafā' al-rāshidīn, p. 445

[2]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol. IV, p. 567, num. 1445. Tārikh khalīfat Ibn khayyāṭ, p. 170. Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā, vol. III, p. 66.

[3]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol. IV, p. 567 num. 1446

[4]. Tathbīt Dalā'il al-nubuwwa, p. 573

[5]. al-Ghārāt, p. 104

During this time, 'Uthmān asked different cities for help. He wrote a letter to people of Mecca to be read in 'Arafa Day. In aforesaid letter, he wrote, "I'm under siege and I've got no food but a trivial supply. I adjure everyone to whom my letter is read to hasten for my help." [2]

'Āyisha was on her way to Ḥadjdj. Marwān was sent by 'Uthmān to help him in people dispersion but she rejected.[3]

For forty days, 'Uthmān was under siege and at last Friday early evening, the 18th Dhi l-Ḥadjdja, 35 A.H. he was murdered. His murderer's name is not exactly specified. Someone's name as Aswadān Ibn Ḥamrān from Tudjīb in Egypt was cited.[4]

Kunāna said, "I heard on Egyptian crying around 'Uthmān's house that he murdered Na'thal but no one had anything to do with him."[5]

Quoting 'Urwa, 'Uthmān's corpse was in Ḥashsh Kawkab for three days but no one did prayer on it.[6] Afterwards, four people among whom were Djubayr Ibn Mut'im and Ḥukaym Ibn Ḥizām assembled and buried him there out of Baqī' by night.[7]

ONGOING VICTORIES

Geographical extension of Islamic country was the major aim of second caliph. All the tribes were mobilized for this purpose and a great deal were sent to different areas. In this era, stabilization of Arab's rule over conquered areas in east and partly in west was the major action of victories. Alexandria, in 25 A.H., started revolution and made effort to rise up against Muslims by a hidden connection to Romans. Arabs, once more, obliged to conquer this city. Riy citizens rebelled as well as Ādharbāydjān so Ḥudhayfa obliged to calm these areas by force. The gate of Ifrīqiya was westerly opened in 26-7 A.H. and Islam was expanded to the heart of Africa. These areas were easily opened and their booties brought Islam a great capital. In 33 A.H., after the renewed revolution in this area and its renewed opening,

---

[1]. Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā, vol. III, pp. 72-73; Tārīkh Ibn Khayyāṭ, p. 170; al-Muṣannaf, Ibn Abī Shayba,vol. VII, p. 441, 514; Tārīkh al-islām, 'Ahd al-khulafā' al-rāshidīn, p. 446; see Tārīkh al-madīnat al-munawwara, vol. II, p. 1286

[2]. Tārīkh al-madīnat al-munawwara, vol. III, p. 1166; al-Imāma wa l-siyāsa, vol. I, pp. 54-56; al-Futūḥ, vol. II, p. 217

[3]. Ibid, vol. III, p. 1172

[4]. Ibid, vol. III, p. 1231

[5]. Ma'rifat al-ṣaḥāba, vol. I, p. 253; Tārīkh al-madīnat al-munawwara, vol. III, p. 1308

[6]. Ma'rifat al-ṣaḥāba, vol. I, p. 259

[7]. Tārīkh al-madīnat al-munawwara, vol. III, p. 1166

its people became calm and tractable. But in Umayya's time, due to excessive pressure on them-in Hishām 'Abd al-Malik time-they rebelled.[1] First in 29 A.H., Muslims were allowed to pass the sea and open the gate of Cyprus. People of Fārs and Istakhr, in the year 29 A.H. started revolution and once more its gate was opened, in an attack, by Muslims. Muslims' first attacks on Ṭabaristān launched in 30 A.H. and through them, Gurgān was occupied. Yazdgard, the last Sassanids king after a lot of vagrancy in 32 A.H. was murdered by a miller in Marw and his dynasty was overwhelmed forever. The gate of Khurāsān, part of which has been conquered and once again rebelled, was opened. Iranian people being still inclined to accept Arab's rule, due to the lack of a definite leadership, rebelled temporarily. But such revolutions comparing to Arab's strong and well-organized forces lacked resistance. In other words, since Iranian religious, tribal, and citizenship solidarity has been lost, it couldn't resist seriously. In the same years, people of Khurāsān and Kirmān violating their peace, were defeated in no time.

EFFECTS OF VICTORIES AND ISLAMIC COMMUNITY

Victories were undoubtedly considered as great changes for both Muslims and human world. This movement and its consequences induced great ethnic and religious changes in human world during 100 years and some centuries respectively. Great immigrations changed some areas ethnically and great religions were exposed to restriction. In addition to nearly a full- scale defeat of Zoroastrian religion, in west Christianity and in east Buddhist were grounded. But the new religion conquered the inhabited quarter of the earth and its particular effect. In this regard, some issues should be taken into consideration. When the effects of victories for victorious Arabs are considered, we observe that the majority of Bedouins left their homes in Ḥidjāz for conquered areas. Their only offering for these country was holy Qur'ān and to some extent hadith. Apart from these two, we face Arabs who got used to Bedouin but now have extreme money and wealth. In Peninsula, they lacked any government but now inherit Sassanids extensive government. Culturally, possessing strict ethnic customs but, for the time being, Arabs in conquered regions encounter a new social and aristocratic life. Hereafter, in conquered lands, there is a sort of cultural duality and Arabs should stake out a clear stand against it. These people's existence cannot naturally be denied or compelled to endure Arabian life. 'Umar dissuated Arabs from imitation and turning into non-Arabs. Such a

---

[1]. al-Kāmil fi l-tārīkh, vol. III, pp. 92 – 93

thing was difficult since most of the Arabs possessed Roman and Iranian slave-girls, they brought them children and a new generation was gradually forming.

'Umar made effort not only to keep them away from fighting against non-Arabs. The residents of conquered lands in Iraq and Iran were allowed to keep them but just pay their land-taxes to 'Umar. Not only leaving the lands for Arabs wasn't technically a right thing due to their lack of expertise, but it brought them about some political problems. 'Umar tried to back non-Arab aristocrats up. Like Arabs, a grant of bounty was determined for non-Arab aristocrats. Some shares like Fīrūz Ibn Yazddjird, Fullūdja farmers, Hurmuzān, and Bābul's farmer, Basṭām Ibn Narsī have been mentioned. 'Umar considered his aim of doing this as the combination of people's (Iranian's) hearts through attracting aristocrats.[1] But Arabs as a victorious and rightful nation were considered superior to others and 'Umar made every possible effort not to mix them with others. The presence of non-Arabs (considered as non-Arab unbelievers by 'Umar) by no means was allowed in Medina, the capital of Islamic country.[2] 'Umar was accidentally murdered by a non-Arab unbeliever had come to Medina through Mughīra's intercession. His complaint when he was almost to die was, "Didn't I tell you not to have entrance of non-Arabs into Medina".[3] Additionally, he was to set free all the captives of wars against Arabs like Radda or the conquest of Iraq and Syria when the number of non-Arab captives was high.[4] He said, "Since God has opened the gates of non-Arab lands to us, it isn't worthwhile having Arab captives for we've got enough non Arab ones."[5] For this, a great deal of money was paid from public treasury to set non-Arab captives free.[6] For Arabs not to imitate non-Arabs, 'Umar ordered that no one had the right to speak in any language but Arabic.[7] It was forbidden for an Arab to

---

[1]. Tarīkh al-ya'qūbī, vol. II, pp. 153 – 154; al-Ma'ārif, p. 361

[2]. 'Abd al-Razzāq, al-Muṣannaf, vol.V, p.474, vol.VI, pp.51-54; Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā, vol. III, p.345

[3]. Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā, vol. IV, pp. 349 – 350

[4]. 'Umar's first measure was to return Arab captives, he said, أول فعل عمر رد سبايا العرب. قال: كرهت أن يسير سنة على العرب What 'Umar did first was to expatriate 'Umar's captives saying, "I am happy! This becomes a tradition degrading Arabs

Tarīkh al-ya'qūbī, vol. II, p. 139; 'Abd al-Razzāq, al-Muṣannaf, vol. VII, p. 380

[5]. al-Kāmil fi l-tārīkh, vol. II, p. 382

[6]. Abū 'Ubayd, al-Amwāl, p. 133; Futūḥ al-buldān, p. 104

[7]. Rabi' al-abrār,vol.I, p.796; 'Abd al-Razzāq, al-Muṣannaf, vol.V, pp. 496- 497; Tārikh Djurdjān, p. 486

dress in a non-Arab garment and for Arabs not to be mistaken with non-Arabs.[1] To 'Umar, Arab Christians should be treated differently from non-Arab ones.[2] In his opinion, Arab was Islam substance [3] and in that time, it was certainly a true thing to be said. 'Umar wanted his rulers not to bother Arabs in their areas in one way or another to bring about their humiliation.[4] The marriage of Arab women and non-Arabs were severely prohibited by 'Umar.[5] It disturbed him a lot when he learnt Nāfi' Ibn Ḥārith placed a non-Arab instead of himself to come to Medina.[6] Ma'mūn said to a Nabataean (Nibṭī) who cried "Alas! 'Umar" in his time, "'Umar believed that if an Arab is in lack of money and his neighbor is a Nabataean, he can sell him! This is 'Umar's biography, do you like to treat you according to it?" [7] One time, made up his mind to propose marriage to 'Umar's daughter. It wasn't done for 'Umar's family came and wanted him to abdicate.[8] Meeting people, 'Abd Allāh Ibn 'Umar said, "Peace be upon you." But visiting a Negro, he said, "O Frog, peace be upon you."[9] It was natural that later on, Khālid Ibn Ṣafwān in the marriage contract of his slave-girl and a slave said, "God's name is superior than being mentioned in the marriage sermon of these two dogs. I announce this adulteress and adulterer, man and wife!"[10]

'Uthmān, to some extent, followed the same policy. The most important factors bringing about destruction of Islamic Community, to 'Uthmān, are as follow, تكامل النعم، بلوغ أولادكم من السبايا، قراءة الأعراب والأعاجم للقرآن "Abundance, the new generation of captive mothers, and Qur'ān recitation by non-Arabs."[11]

Ethnic mixture in Arab brought some effects about which cannot be prevented. Arabs' possession of some tribal customs and their lack of a disciplined and regular culture were considered the major reasons. Meanwhile, Arab tribal structure strengthened through 'Umar's measure in forming Dīwān based on ethnic system played a key role in the protection of

---

[1]. Ḥayāt ṣaḥāba, vol. II, p. 802

[2]. Futūḥ al-buldān, pp.185-186; 'Abd al-Razzāq, al-Muṣannaf,vol.VI, p.99, al-Kharādj, p. 221

[3]. Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā, vol. IV, pp. 337 – 339; 'Abd al-Razzāq, al-Muṣannaf,vol. I, p. 325

[4]. Tārikh al-ṭabarī, vol. I,p.2741; Imtidād al-'arab, p. 22

[5]. Imtidād al-'arab, p. 22

[6]. 'Abd al-Razzāq, al-Muṣannaf,vol. XI, p. 439; Ḥayāt ṣaḥāba,vol.II, p. 150

[7]. 'Uyūn al-akhbār, vol. I, p. 230; see al-Maḥāsin wa l-masāwī, vol. II, p. 227

[8]. Ḥilyat al-awlīyā', vol. I, p.186; Luṭf al-tadbīr, p. 199; al-zuhd wa l-Raqā'iq, Djuz' Nu'aym Ibn Ḥammād, p. 52

[9]. Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā, vol. IV, p. 160

[10]. al-Bayān wa l-tabyīn,vol.II, p.250

[11]. al-Fitnat al-kubrā, p. 72

Arab culture. Setting Arab tribes was the aim of stabilization of pure Arab cities however very soon, captives of war and non-Arab immigrants settled there. These cities internally possessed some divided tribes and non-Arabs in there had got special parishes. These cities were distinctive from those in the past for they have been formed through Islamic and Arab features.

The number of Arab immigrants most of whom left Iraq for Iran was excessive. It is said that in Kūfa, fifty thousand and twenty-four thousand houses were allocated to Rabi'a, Muḍar and other Arabs respectively. In Imām 'Alī (a) time, the number of people whose names existed in Baṣra administration tribunal touched sixty thousands.[1]

The quick regional influence of Islam was considered as one of the important effects of Arab residence in Iran. In Ādharbāydjān, the expansion of Islam was the result of Arab residence there. Arabs bought a great deal of lands there and started a permanent residence. It is said that going to Ādharbāydjān, Ash'ath Ibn Qays observed a lot of Muslims reciting Qur'ān.[2] Arabs' other residence was Riy due to its significance. Arab cities were few, according to Ya'qūbī.[3] Qazwīn, because of its frontier significance with Diylam, was the residence of Arabs who left Kūfa for this region. In al-Buldān, Ya'qūbī considered human geography of cities, which is of great importance, in regard to Arab and non-Arab.[4] According to some narrations, Qum was basically on Arab residence and some tribes like Ash'arī and Midhḥadj settled there. After repeated victories different regions of Iran were permanent residences of Arabs. Meanwhile, unlike Egypt and north of Africa, Iran didn't turn into Arabian, on the contrary, its Arab residents gradually turned into Iranian.

Financially, victories greatly affected Muslims. Arabs, before Islam, severely suffered from economic deprivation. But after victories, they had a comfortable life resulted from booties abundance. This issue brought about some particular ethnical consequences from which in Islamic community resulted constant corruption due to the lack of continuous training. Figuring out such conditions, 'Umar strictly made effort to keep noble men of companions away from comfort and extravagance. However, in 'Uthmān's time, the society severely suffered from sedition and corruption for 'Uthmān himself was an aristocrat and unable to control the situation. The natural point was new community's lack of forces for religious teaching and

---

[1]. Imtidād al-'arab, p. 26

[2]. Futūḥ al-buldān, p. 329; Imtidād al-'arab, p. 23

[3]. al-Buldān, p. 269

[4]. Dr. Ṣāliḥ al-'Alī, in "Imtidād al-'arab fī Ṣadr al-islām", studied the Arabs' jouney and their settlement in cities of Iran based on Ya'qubī's source and other books.

learning. This problem was to some extent solved by companions but neither their number nor their knowledge can cover such an extensive land.

In 'Uthmān's time, companions obtained a lot of wealth and clever Muslims kept the limit of their wealth. Mas'ūdī made some useful information available to us.[1] In spite of 'Umar's carefulness in this regard, he caused Badrī companions to obtain a great wealth in no time through his system for distribution of "grant of bounty". Forming an aristocratic life, 'Uthmān later on, was a typical of aristocracy prevalence among people. This aristocracy, for the most part, existed among the Muhādjirūn for their superiority to the Anṣār in the arrangement of tribunal based on 'Umar's policy.[2] And this policy of Quraysh's superiority to non-Quraysh, was followed by 'Uthmān as well.[3] While religiously comparing Anṣār were in a better position than Quraysh.

Ibn 'Abbās said, "Most of the Messenger(s)' hadiths were available to Anṣār."[4]

It is said that Anṣār's women in religion obtained understanding[5] and were more religious than the Muhādjirūn.[6] Also, in Quraysh, just one person who knew Qur'ān by heart existed according to the narration.[7]

Ṭāhā Ḥusayn studied 'Uthmān's Qurayshī policies and its effect on Anṣār's seclusion and the rule of Quraysh over other Arabs.[8] Policy of the Muhādjirūn's superiority to the Anṣār and Quraysh to non-Quraysh was, to some extent, accepted in the community so that its settlement by Imām 'Alī (a), with all his influence, was not possible. Their objection to Imām was why didn't he, like 'Umar, consider them superior to others?[9]

Aristocracy along with the lack of religious training intensified the community problem so that Kūfa witnessed adultery of Mughīra Ibn Shu'ba and drinking of Walīd Ibn 'Uqba, governors of such an important city. Mu'āwiya was also a typical of that and not wanting to be included in Kanz verse, he made up his mind to omit the first "v" letter so that it might include

---

1. Murūdj al-dhahab, vol. II, pp. 332-333.

2. Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, vol. VIII, p.111.

3. Tārikh al-madīnat al-munawwara, vol. II, p. 989.

4. Sunnan al-Dārimī, introduction, section 46

5. 'Abd al-Razzāq, al-Muṣannaf, vol. I, pp. 314 -315

6. Ḥayāt ṣaḥāba, vol. II, p. 87

7. Ibn Djūzī, al-Adhkiyā', p. 102

8. al-Fitnat al-kubrā, pp. 68-85-86

9. Nahdj al-sa'āda, vol. I. pp. 199, 200, 207, 272, 228, 229; Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, vol. VII, pp. 41-43

the people of The Book.[1] The names of some Quraysh been punished by whip are mentioned by Muḥammad Ibn Ḥabīb. Among them is 'Umar's son, Abū Shaḥma, who committed adultery to 'Umar's step-daughter and he was punished by a whip. 'Ubayd Allāh and 'Āṣim, 'Umar's offsprings were whipped by 'Umar and 'Uthmān respectively for drinking.[2] Imām Ḥusayn (a) witnessed the latter and this caused, accordingly to Muḥammad Ibn Ḥabīb, enmity between family of 'Umar and that of 'Alī. Suhayl Ibn 'Abd al-Raḥmān Ibn 'Awf was whipped for drinking.[3] Among these, the names of other companions' sons had been mentioned. The lack of punishment in the case of others didn't mean that they were in a better position. Take the example of 'Umar, son of Sa'd Ibn Abī Waqqāṣ, who martyred Imām Ḥusayn (a) Karbalā. Karbalā's event principally indicates the depth of mental and ethical corruption and deviation in the Islamic community.

To caliphs, victories were considered a sacred Djihād which not only had a lot of booties but can save Arabs from hunger. This Djihād is considered sacred even if it is accompanied by some mistakes like that of Khālid Ibn Walīd with Mālik Ibn Nuwayra. Such mistakes don't bring about the lack of his title, i.e. God's sword.

In second caliph's opinion, if the sentence, حي على خير العمل "Hasten to good deeds," was omitted from the prayer call, Djihād would be most important to people than prayer, people's concern about victories and not having anything to do with the internal affairs was another feature of victories. For 'Uthmān, being entangled in revolution, one of the solutions was to send opposers to the borders to fight there against enemies.[4] But those aware of the reality wrote to the frontier controllers that Djihād exists in Medina not Diylam.[5] Mu'āwiya benefited from this weapon for opponents dispersion.[6]

In order to recognize deviations made in the community, in fact, difficulties of Imām 'Alī (a) who made his Messengership the community reform should be recognized.

People depended on public treasury and their grants of bounty to the extent that 'Umar said, "If I want, I can make these people unbelievers."

---

[1]. See al-durr al-manthūr, vol. III, p. 232

[2]. al-Munammaq, pp. 367-395

[3]. Ibid, p. 397

[4]. al-Futūḥ, vol. II, pp. 178- 179; Murūdj al-dhahab, vol. II, p. 237; al-Kāmil fi l-tārikh, vol. III, p. 149; Tārikh al-madīnat al-munawwara, vol. II, p. 1096

[5]. al-Kāmil fi l-tārikh, vol. III, p. 150

[6]. Ya'qubī says, "Mu'āwīya by dint of money made the opponents quiet, sometimes he was sent to the war especially the front." Tārikh al-ya'qūbī, vol. II, p. 238

They asked, "How?"

He replied, "I'll cut their shares."[1]

Also Abū Dja'far Naqīb said, "No one would object to 'Umar if he changed their Qibla from Ka'ba to Jerusalem or omitted one of the five unit prayers for people made every effort to obtain money and wealth and they kept still when they reached it." [2]

To Imām 'Alī (a) on the threshold of his caliphate, the situation of the community was like that of pre-Islam.[3]

---

[1]. al-Mi'yār wa l-muwāzina, p. 87

[2]. Sharh nahdj al-balāgha, vol. XII, p. 96

[3]. Nahdj al-sa'āda, vol. I, p. 189

CHAPTER VI
IMĀM 'ALĪ'S IMAMATE

IMĀM 'ALĪ ALONGSIDE THE PROPHET

In the first version of the book, we proportionately and briefly discussed about Imām 'Alī (a)'s role in the changes of Prophet's significant time. Imām's position and his reliability to the Messenger (s) is briefly discussed. Imām 'Alī (a) had the honor to be brought up in the house of Messenger (s).[1] In this regard, a great deal of attractive narrations collected by Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd exist. Among them, in a narration by Zayd Ibn 'Alī Ibn Ḥusayn, he said that in that time the Messenger made meat and date soft by putting it in his mouth for being easily eaten and then it was put in Imām 'Alī's mouth.[2] Imām 'Alī (a) was the first one who believed in the Messenger (s) due to this kinship.

He said, "No one but the Messenger took me the lead in prayer."[3]

Since, in this regard, a great deal of witnesses and evidence exists; therefore, there is no room for doubts of equitable people. Concerning Imām's embrace Islam, it is reportedly said that he was invited by the Messenger (s) to embrace Islam and this indicates Imām's mental maturity.[4]

Mas'ūdī says, "Some said that Imām in the time of his embrace Islam was not old enough so he was only an infant in that time."[5]

The prophet truly knew the value of devoted companions, while Imām's self-sacrifice in all the fields was observed, hoe the prophet can consider him like the others. This triggered that in every right time, Imām's reliability and value was expresses to people through the prophet's remarks about Imām's features and characteristics. These are the issues available to us in reliable sources of history and hadith under the title of Imām's virtues. Later on when in second century, the books of hadith were compiled, their compilers and narrators were to the most part influenced by tendencies of

---

[1]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol. II, p. 90

[2]. Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, vol. XII, pp. 198-201

[3]. Nahdj al-balāgha, sermon 131

[4]. al-Mi'yār wa l-muwāzina, pp. 68-69; Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol. I, p.112

[5]. al-Tanbīh wa l-ishrāf, p. 198

'Uthmān's followers who couldn't tolerate any virtue for Imām. Additionally what the Umayyads and 'Uthmān supporters in the Umayya time made about caliphs and companion defenders was narrated. Some of these fakes ascribed to caliphs were, in essence, Imām's virtues. These distortions came to a deadlock for Imām's narrated virtues and their narrators were respectively serious and reliable to be remained in books. Narrators of Kūfa, in this regard, played a significant role in keeping these virtues.

Aḥmad Ibn Ḥanbal said, "'Alī is the one for whom a great deal of true virtues is said."[1]

He said, إن ابن أبي طالب لا يقاس به أحد[2] "No noe deserves being compared to 'Alī."

Among these virtues, some narrations for whose correctness there is no doubt can be mentioned. Significance of some is to the extent that through them Imām's personality in the Messenger's eyes can be imagined.

Abū Sa'īd Khudrī said, كان لعلي من النبي (ص) دخلة ليست لأحد وكان للنبي (ص) من علي دخلة ليست لأحد غيره فكانت دخلة النبي (ص) من علي ان النبي (ص) كان يدخل عليهم كل يوم[3] "No one met the prophet more than 'Alī, so did the Prophet. The Prophet's meeting was to come up to them every day."

Also Zayd Ibn Thābit said to Imām, أنت من رسول الله (ص) بالمكان الذي لا يعدله احد[4] "No one owns thy dignity in front of the Messenger (s)."

These words were said by Zayd when he used to tenaciously support 'Uthmān. This caused Imām to know the Prophet (s) as long as none of the other companions did so.[5] One evidence indicating the Prophet's heed to Imām was that he married Fāṭima (s), world selected women, to him. Abū Bakr and 'Umar had popped the question to Fāṭima before but they were rejected by the Prophet.

But Imām (a) proposing marriage to Fāṭima was accepted and said, لست بدجال[6] "I'm not deceiver." "Fāṭima is yours."

---

[1]. Ibn Djūzī, Manāqib Aḥmad Ibn Ḥanbal, p. 160; Ṭabaqāt al-ḥanābilā, vol. I, p. 319

[2]. Manāqib Aḥmad Ibn Ḥanbal, pp. 163

[3]. 'Abd al-Razzāq, al-Muṣannaf, vol. X, p. 140; Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol. II, p. 98 and in the footnote of Tārikh Dimashq, vol.XXXVIII, p. 33; Amālī Ibn al-Shiykh, p. 33; Hadith III, section 27

[4]. al-Futūḥ, vol. II, p. 165

[5]. See Subul al-hudā wa l-Rishād, vol. VI, p. 642

[6]. Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā, vol. VIII, p. 22. this can be read in two ways " 'لست lastu" and " 'لست lasta". Ibn Sa'd considered the first one and interpreted as I am not deceiver. It means that the prophet had pledged 'Alī of his marriage to Fāṭima. A research in the narration of proposal, show there existed no promise. So what does the Prophet's

Having married Fāṭima, Imām (a) was asked to find a house but it was far from the Prophet's. And this was done through Ḥārith Ibn Nu'mān's devotion and leaving his house for 'Alī.[1]

Perhaps due to such a reason, 'Abd Allāh Ibn 'Umar said, " For knowing 'Alī's status to the prophet, you'd better see location of his house to that of the prophet."[2]

In the course of the brotherhood, the Messenger selected 'Alī (a) as his "brother".[3] When the Messenger made sermon, Imām 'Alī (a) used to repeat his remarks in a farther distance.[4] And in the time of the Prophet's anger, no one but 'Alī (a) dared to talk to him.[5] People made 'Alī (a) as their mediator in solving their problems.[6]

Quoting 'Āyisha, the Sunnites said, "Fāṭima among the women and 'Alī among the men were the most beloved to the Messenger." [7]

In Manzalat tradition which is one of the most definite merits of Imām, the Messenger regarded his relationship with 'Alī (a) as that of Moses with Aaron.[8] In case of any problem, when someone was to be sent for settling things, The Messenger sent 'Alī (a).[9] Once Imām was asked, why is it that you quote traditions more than the other companions? He answered, لأني كنت إذا سألته أنبأني وإذا سكتّ ابتدأني "Because When I asked the Messenger a question, He taught me the knowledge and when I kept silent, he started to speak himself."[10]

Imām used to say, I faced nothing unknown unless I asked of the Messenger about it and committed the answer to my memory[11]. I memorized everything he said and never forgot anything.[1]

---

remark mean? Hence the reading lasta seems to be more probable, implying a reference to the previous suitors.

[1]. Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā, vol. VIII, p. 22

[2]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol. II, pp. 180-181

[3]. Ṣaḥiḥ Tirmidhī, vol. XIII, p. 170; Ibn Abī Shayba, al-Muṣannaf, vol. XII, pp. 62 – 82; al-Mustadrak, vol. III, p.14; Rabī' al-abrār, vol. I, p. 807; Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol. I, p. 270, vol. II, p. 145

[4]. Rabī' al-abrār, vol. III, p. 732

[5]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol. II, p. 107; al-Mustadrak, vol. III, p.130

[6]. al-Tarātīb al-idāriyya, vol. I, pp. 56-58

[7]. al-Istī'āb, vol.I, p.378; Tārīkh Djurdjān, p.218

[8]. As mentioned in the text, no one doubts this tradition

[9]. Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā, vol. VII, p. 435; al-Tarātīb al-Idariyya, vol. I, p.p 443,444;3

[10]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol II, p. 98

[11]. Nahdj al-balāgha, Sermon 208

In a letter he wrote, وأنا من رسول الله كالصنو من الصنو والذراع من العضد "My relation with the Messenger is that of one branch with another or of the wrist with the arm."[2]

He said, "I followed the Messenger just as a baby camel follows its mother."[3]

إني لم أردّ على الله ولا على رسوله ساعة قطّ

"I never disobeyed God or his Messenger at all."[4]

Concerning the declaration of aquittance, God told His Messenger, This message must be delivered either by you or someone on behalf of you. That is why he made Abū Bakr return midway and handed the message to Imām 'Alī so that it might be read on "Greater Pilgrimage".[5] There are beautiful sentences, in Qāṣi'a sermon, about Imām's intimacy with the Messenger. Here are some of his remarks,

"You know my position of close kinship and special relationship with the Prophet. From the very beginning of my life he took me in his lap and kept me embraced to his chest. He used to lay me beside him in his bed, bring his body close to mine and make me smell his fragrance. He used to feed me with his hands often chewing something for me. He never heard me lying nor did he see me doing something wrong. When he was weaned, God appointed his greatest angel to be with him day and night so that he might cover the paths of greatness and avail himself of the worldly virtues. And I used to follow him like a young camel following in the footprints of its mother. Every day he showed me in the form of a banner some of his high traits and commanded me to follow them. Every year he used to go in seclusion in Ḥarā'.I saw him and no one did so but me. In those days, Islam was the religion of Holy Prophet and his wife, Khadīdja exclusively. I was the third of the trio. I beheld the divine light of revelation and prophethood and smelled the heavenly fragrance of messngership."[6]

Being on such intimate terms with the Messenger, Imām said, "By God, there is no verse revealed unless I know about what and where in it was sent.[7] According to Ibn 'Abbās, no verse was sent by God unless 'Alī (a) was Amīr and noble. God reproved Muḥammad's companions but always

---

[1]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol. II, p. 121

[2]. Nahdj al-balāgha, Letter 45

[3]. Taṣnīf Nahdj al-balāgha, p. 355

[4]. Nahdj al-balāgha, Sermon 195

[5]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol. I, p. 382; vol. II, p.p. 123,155

[6]. Nahdj al-balāgha, Sermon192

[7]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol. II, p. 99

spoke highly of 'Alī (a).[1] Regarding those who wondered at 'Alī (a) being the divider of Heaven and Hell, Aḥmad Ibn Ḥanbal said, "Hasn't this been narrated that the Messenger told 'Alī (a), لا يحبك إلا مؤمن ولا يبغضك إلا منافق "Only the believer loes thee and only the hypocrite loathes thee." "Yes", they said. Continued he, "As the believer abides in the heaven and the hypocrite abides in the Hell, 'Alī (a) is the divider of the Heaven and the Hell."[2]

'Umar Ibn 'Abd al-'Azīz used to say, "If this ignorant people were informed of what we knew about 'Alī (a), not two of them would obey us."[3]

As Salmān states, "Should 'Alī (a) leave you, there would remain nobody to inform you of the prophet's secrets."[4] How right Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd is to say, "No one helped the Prophet as much as Abū Ṭālib and his sons,'Alī (a) and Dja'far did."[5]Once somebody complained to the Prophet about 'Alī (a) and he stated three times, Leave 'Alī (a) alone.[6]

فإن علياً مني وأنا منه وهو ولي كل مومن

"'Alī is from me and I am from him; he is guardian of every faithful."

At the night of immigration, 'Alī (a) saved prophet's life [7]. In the battle of Badr 30 polytheists were put to death by him. In the battle of Uḥud, where many escaped the battle, he remained with prophet and saved his life. One stroke of 'Alī's sword inflicted on 'Amr Ibn 'Abdiwad in Khandaq was considered by the Prophet to be worth more than the worship of Jinn and mankind. This blow put the enemy to rout.[8] In most battles, Imām was the flag bearer of Muslim's army.[9]

Undoubtedly, Imām's knowledge had no parallel in Prophet's companions. This is an issue cited by the prophet and his companions, and testified by history. This word of the Messenger, انا مدينه العلم وعلي بابها "I am the

---

[1]. Ma'rifat al-ṣaḥāba, vol. I, p. 298; al-Mu'djam al-Kabīr, vol. XI, p. 264; Ḥilyat al-awliyā', vol. I, p. 64

[2]. Ṭabaqāt al-ḥanābila, vol. I, p. 320

[3]. Rabi' al-abrār, vol. I, p. 499

[4]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol. II, p. 183

[5]. Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, vol. VII, p. 174

[6]. al-Amālī fī Āthār al-ṣaḥāba, p. 80, footnote of Musnad Aḥmad, vol. IV, p. 437, Ṣaḥīḥ Tirmidhī, no.3796; Musnad Ṭayālisī No.829; Traits of 'Alī (a), Nasā'ī, p. 65; al-Ḥilyat al-'awliyā', vol. VI, p. 294; al-Mustadrak, vol. III, p. 110; al-Mu'djam al-Kabīr, vol. XVIII, p. 128; and see, vol. IV, p. 322

[7]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol. I, p. 260

[8]. Tārīkh Mukhtaṣar al-duwal, p. 95; Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha vol. V, p. 7

[9]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol. II, p. 91,94; Ḥayāt ṣaḥāba, vol. II, p.p. 514-515

city of knowledge and 'Alī (a) is its door," bears abundant evidence of this. Uttered on the pulpit, Imām 's remark, سلوني قبل ان تفقدوني "Ask me before you miss me,"[1] was also indicative of the superiority of his knowledge. This claim, according to Sa'īd Ibn Musayyib, was laid by no one but Imām.[2]

The prophet charged him with the duty of teaching ablution and tradition to people.[3] 'Āyisha, whose animosity toward Fāṭima and 'Alī (a) dated back to prophet's time, said, علي أعلم الناس بالسنة[4] "'Alī is most conscious of Sunna."

According to one of the well-known successors called 'Aṭā', 'Alī is the most impoverished one among the Prophet's companions.[5]

'Umar Ibn 'Abd al-'Azīz also called him the most devout of the companions.[6] Hundreds of pages can be written about Imām's virtues but this amount will suffice our book which is a short review of Islam's history.

IMĀM 'ALĪ AND CALIPHS

If it is true to assume that at Messenger's time, Muhādjirūn were of two different political fronts and some were trying to win the caliphate, then one must accept that the relations between Imām and Shiykhs were rather strained. Reports say nothing to prove their disputes, but nor does any reminiscence show their friendship. On 'Āyisha's own confession, her being at enmity with Imām went back to Prophet's time and this can be considered as bearing witness to the differences between the families of 'Alī and Abū Bakr. It has been said that when Fāṭima passed away, all Messenger's wives attended the Hāshimites mourning ceremony except for 'Āyisha who feigning illness, didn't participate and even was told to be expressing joy of that.[7] Anyway, Immediately after Abū Bakr's caliphacy and Imām's insistence on proving his rightfulness, unfriendly relations between them were developed. Attacking Imām's house, Fāṭima's being in sulk as well as not permitting Shiykhs to attend Imām's funeral,[8] all aggravated the differneces.following that, Imām secluded and went on with his own life.

---

[1]. Nahdj al-balāgha, Sermon 189

[2]. Tārīkh Yaḥyā Ibn Mu'ayn,vol.III,p. 143

[3]. Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā, vol. IV, p. 52

[4]. Tārīkh al-Kabīr, Bukhārī,vol.II, p. 255

[5]. Maqtal al-imām al-Amīr al-Mu'minīn (□)

[6]. Ibid, p.107

[7]. Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha,, vol. IX, p. 198

[8]. See, al-Mustadrak, vol. III, p. 162; Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā, vol. VIII, p.p. 29-30; al-Tanbīh al-ashrāf, p. 250; Wafā' al-wafā', p.p. 995-996,1000

The administration expected Imām, in addition to taking the oath of allegiance, to refrain from assertion of rightfulness and embark on consolidating their authoritative realm while having swords in hand but

He refused to do so. Naturally, adopting such a position Imām was to be humiliated by the administration in front of people. This policy could result in Imām's further solitude.

Cursing Quraysh, Imām said,"Oh God, I seek your help against the Quraysh and those supporting them." فإنهم قطعو رحمي وصغروا عظيم منـــزلتي وأجمعوا على منازعتي أمرا هو لي "They have cut asunder my kinship,lowered my high position and joined together to contest the right to which I was entitled."[1]

Continues he, "I looked around but found no one to shield and help me except the members of my family. I refrained from fighting them to death, so I overlooked with grieved eyes"[2]

This remark refers to Caliphs' policy of humiliating Imām. In sermon of Shiqshiqiyya, referring to the consultation Imām states, "When he ('Umar) was due to die, he selected a group of candidates and included me among them. Oh, good Heavens! What had I to do with this consultation? I wonder why they never equaled me to the first of them but to these people while I was as competent as him."[3]

It was intolerable for Imām to be among Ṭalḥa, Zubayr and 'Uthmān who held him in contempt. Strange to say, 'Umar blamed all 6 men chosen by him for some wrongdoings. What Imām was blamed for, in this regard, was extremely unfounded and humiliating. He was blamed for being kind of a joker, فيه دعابة[4]. Later, based on this very remark of 'Umar, Mu'āwiya[5] and 'Amr Ibn 'Āṣ told about Imām, فيه تلعابة[6] "He is a humorous man."

Seroiusly rejecting this accusation laid against him by 'Amr Ibn 'Āṣ, Imām in fact rejected 'Umar's remark. [7] The life of Imām who was secluded in Medina caused him to remain unknown. The time went by fast, and the Imām, by himself, in Medina, particularly among the old companions of Prophet(s) seemed as acquaintance. Yet, no one knew Imām in Iraq and

---

[1]. Nahdj al-balāgha, Sermon 172; al-Ghārāt, vol. I, p. 309

[2]. Nahdj al-balāgha, Sermon 217; some parts have been added to this sermon of Nahdj al-balāgha; See,al-Djamal, p. 123;Ibid.footnote of, al-Imāma wa l-siyāsa, vol. I, p. 155; al-Ghārāt, p. 204

[3]. Nahdj al-balāgha, Sermon 3

[4]. Tārīkh Mukhtaṣar al-duwal, p. 103

[5]. Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, vol. I, p. 25

[6]. al-Imtā' wa l-mu'ānisa, vol. III, p. 183

[7] Nahdj al-balāgha, Sermon 84; Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol. II, p. 127,145,151; Nahdj al-sa'āda, vol. II, p. 88

Damascus. Just a few Yemenī tribes seeing him since his few-month-long trip to Yemen were acquaintance to him.

Djundab Ibn 'Abd Allāh said, "Once after swearing (on oath of) allegiance to 'Uthmān I went to Iraq, therein I quoted 'Alī's virtues for the people. The best answer I heard from the people was, "Discard these remarks. Think of something of your benefit."

I answered, "These issues are beneficial for both of us." Yet, after my statement, he was to stand up and leave.[1]

According to Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, Muḥammad Ibn Sulaymān's interpretation was that one of the factors leading to discard in 'Uthmān's era was the constitution of council. For, each member of the council had serious aspiration for caliphate. Typically, Ṭalḥa was among those who looked forward to caliphate. Besides, Zubayr not only helped him but also regarded himself as deserving of governing. Their hope for the caliphate was more than that of Imām 'Alī (a). Inasmuch as the two Shiykhs discredited him and held him in low esteem. Hence, he was forgotten. Most of those knowing his virtues had been died at the time of the Prophet(s), and a new generation was found that deemed him the same as other Muslims. What merely left among his honors was that he is the cousin of the Prophet(s), his daughter's husband and his grandchildren's father. The remainder of facts was forgotten. Quraysh also felt such a hatred for him that was never felt for anyone. To the same extent, Quraysh loved Ṭalḥa and Zubayr, since there was no reason for abhorring them.[2]

Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd himself, having pointed out that the people in Ṣiffīn were waiting to regard 'Ammār's presence in a front as the rightfulness of that front, said, "How surprising the peoples are! Since they accept 'Ammār as the criterion of truth and error; however, they don't regard the very 'Alī (a) as a criterion about whom the Prophet(s) has cited the hadith of sainthood and also said, لا يحبك إلا مؤمن ولا يبغضك إلا منافق "Only the believer loves thee, and only the hypocrite loathes thee."

This is because all Quraysh tried to, from the very beginning, cover his virtues, remove public memory from him, ruin his features and eliminate his high status in the hearts of people.[3] Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd nicely analyzes the reasons behind the Quraysh's grudge against Imām 'Alī(a).[4]

Once Imām was asked:"Do you think if the Messenger(s) had a mature son, Arabs would hand the governorship over to him?"

---

1. Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, vol. IX, p. 58

2. Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, vol. IX, p. 28

3. Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, vol.VIII, p.18

4. Ibid. vol.XIII, p.299-300

Imām responded: "If he had done something different from what I did, he would have been killed."

Arabs hated what Muḥammad (s) did and felt envious of what God had granted him... they from that time attempted to disentitle Ahl al-Bayt after his departure. Quraysh found his name a means of domination and ladder of promotion and if other wise, they never worshipped God even one day after him and would become apostate. A while after, conquests, come one after another, no hunger and poverty remained after starvation and destitution. This led to popularity of Islam and they kept religion in their many a heart because, however, truth brought this about. Afterwards, these conquests were attributed to strategy and thought of emirs. Among them, some were magnified and some others were forgotten, فكنا ممن خمل ذكره وخبت ناره وانقطع صوته وصيته، حتى أكل الدهر علينا وشرب، ومضت السنون والاحقاب بما فيها، ومات كثير ممن يعرف ونشأ كثير ممن لا يعرف "We were from someone whose memory was last whose luminosity was cut and whose outcry was stopped as if time swallowed us. Years passed this way, many known figures were dead and those unknown came into stage. Under these conditions, what curled the son's son do? You know that the Messenger(s) never kept me close to himself for his kinship, with me but he did it in time of Djihād ad and advice.[1] It was just for the same reason of Imām being forgotten in Muslim community he, in his caliphate time, tried to use every chase to introduce himself and speak about his efforts for Islam in the Messenger's time.[2]

Imām held cold relationship with Abū Bakr with no seemingly left memory. In his contact with 'Umar, Imām's memories are many available, that mainly relied upon his judiciary assistance to 'Umar as well as response to some consultations discussed earlier. 'Umar refused to blatantly slander Imām and probably Imām did so.

But 'Uthmān was different and never did he bear Imām's ideas and once he told Imām:"You are not better than Marwān Ibn Ḥakam to me?"[3]

'Abbās asked 'Uthmān to stand by Imām.

'Uthmān said:"What I first fell you is that if 'Alī wants, no one stands dearer to me than him.[4] Of course, Imām was unwilling to overlook deviations for his friendship with him. For this, Imām's relationship with 'Uthmān was partly closer and partly harsher."[5]

---

[1]. Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, vol.XX, p.298-299.

[2]. For example, Nahdj al-sa'āda, vol.II, pp.222,314

[3]. Murūdj al-dhahab, vol.II, p.342

[4]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.V, p.14

[5]. Tārīkh al-madīnat al-munawwara, vol.III, pp. 1045-1046

Once an Anṣārī woman had a quarrel with one of the Hāshimites women and when she was acquitted, she was told by 'Uthmān, "This is your cousin, 'Alī's decision!"[1]

Opposition to government was difficult for Imām. He attempted, in early years, to resort to seclusion to avoid faring the government. Sa'd Ibn 'Ubāda was a good experiment. He failed to pay allegiance and immediately in time of caliph I or II, he was told to have been killed by Djinns. Previously mention was made from some sources that his murder had been politically planned.[2]

According to Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, Abū Dja'far Naqīb (Yaḥyā Ibn Abī Zayd) was asked:"I am amazed how 'Alī survived this long after the Messenger's demise, from all Quraysh's vengeance."

Abū Dja'far said:"Had he not belittled and isolated himself, he might have been killed."

He let himself off memories and became engaged in worshipping, Qur'ān reading and prayer, leaving his first state of mind and sword as if he were like a sinner who had repented, probing the earth and living on the mountains like a monk. He survived because he obeyed rulers of the time; other wise he would have been killed".

He then refers to Khālid's action to kill Imām.[3] Mu'min al-Ṭāq also believe that Imām made no political effort in this time because he feared being murdered by jinns (like Sa'd).[4]

Of course, this did not mean that Imām never tried to use chances to take back his rights. From the very outset, he refused to swear allegiance for a few months.[5] Further, from early times, he joined his family to homes of Anṣār to revert back his rights. He insisted so much that he was blamed for having a greedy eye on caliphate.

Imām quoting someone said:"O son of Abū Ṭālib! You raise a greed on this!

He said:"No, by God, you are greedier than I am. You are for from the Messenger(s) and I'm closer to him. I asked for the right I possessed, but you refrain me from having it".[6]

---

[1]. Tārikh al-madīnat al-munawwara. vol.III, p.967; Muntakhab Kanz al-'Ummāl, vol.II, p.204

[2]. Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, vol.XVII, p.62

[3]. Ibid. vol.XIII, p.301-302

[4]. Ibid. vol.XVII, p.62

[5]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol 1, p. 585; al-Kāmil fi l-tārikh, vol 2, p. 325

[6]. Nahdj al-balāgha, sermon 172, al-Ghārāt, vol.I, p.307

Imām made reasoning of this kind a lot, يا معشر قريش! إنا أهل البيت أحق بهذا الامر منكم، أما كان فينا من يقرء القرآن ويعرف السنّة ويدين بدين الحق؟ "O Quraysh people! We, Ahl al-Bayt deserve more than you in caliphate! Are there no people among us who read Qur'ān and follow Sunna and true religion."[1]

On Imām's evaluating successorship of three caliphs, it is to be said that he was in no time free to offer his appraisal of Shiykhs. Unlike 'Uthmān, what he believed, he found a chance to retell it. It was why his troops in Kūfa were included of those, except a few, had approved of Shiykhs and he could not talk freely about them. Once he found a chance to talk some part of his sufferings but he was stopped talking. Upon 'Abbās's insistence, he kept on talking, تلك شقشقة هدرت "No, Ibn 'Abbās! What you heard was flame of grief that rose."[2]

Imām with all caution was never prepared to adopt conditions of 'Abd al-Raḥmān Ibn 'Awf for caliphate during council of caliphate. Ibn'Awf conditioned that if Imām were willing to act upon conduct of Shiykhs, he would place him caliph.

Imām said:"I would act according to my Idjtihād".

Imām openly rejected conduct of Shiykhs and believed that it was in the most part against conduct of the Messenger(s) and based on improper Idjtihād. Imām says he has obeyed Abū Bakr in affairs he obeyed God.[3] Imām's words and his approach here show that he never admired past manners.

In later times, Mu'āwiya wrote to Imām that he felt envious of early caliphs and rebelled against them!

Imām wrote back, "you think I am against them an dwant to take revenge. If so, why are you worried to be inquired? You are not blamed... and you said you found me like a camel harnessed to swear allegiance. By God, you wanted to scold, praise and scandalize but you're scandalized yourself. What belittles a Muslim who is oppressed and assured of his religion. His certainty is strong and his hesitation is aside? ... And I never apologize for caviling 'Uthmān because of innovations.[4]

Despite Imām's explicit criticism, particularly his attitude in council, one cannot refer to Imām's familial relationships with 'Umar, or 'Uthmān for his belief in their proper rule. Even his praise of some caliphs compared to others cannot be a reason for his basic approval of them. When he learned

---

[1]. Al-Ghārāt, vol 1, p.307

[2]. Nahdj al-balāgha, sermon 3, Nathr al-durr, vol.I, p.274

[3]. al-Ghārāt, vol.I, p.307

[4]. Nahdj al-balāgha, letter 28; Waq'at Ṣiffīn, pp.86-91. Here, Mu'āwiya's letter to Imām and Imām's reply are fully mentioned.

that he could not face the party and a campaign waged is not beneficial to Islam, he chose to compromise. Imām justified his allegiance to Abū Bakr and his approval according to Muhādjir and Anṣār as to a necessity and preservation of unity among Muslims.[1]

Imām referred to Aaron's speech in front of Moses(a) for justifying his silence, Aaron said,

إِنِّي خَشِيتُ أَنْ تَقُولَ فَرَّقْتَ بَيْنَ بَنِي إِسْرَائِيلَ.

"I feared lest thou shouldst say: Thou hast caused division among the Children of Israel."[2]

Imām said of Saqīfa, بل عرفت أنّ حقي هو المأخوذ وقد تركته لهم، تجاوز الله عنهم "When I learned I am withdrawn with my rights, I left to them, may God punish them."[3]

In the past, Sunnis never accepted that Ahl al-Bayt found themselves more qualified for caliphate than others, that is early caliphs. Yet, now somewhat broad-minded factions of Sunnis admit that 'Alī(a) simply pledged allegiance just for unison with Abū Bakr while knowing himself rightful for caliphate.[4]

Anyway, Imām's isolated life in that society indicates that both Imām and caliphs knew they can not treat others in such a way that it might mean confirmation of their view, particularly about caliphate. Meanwhile, frequenting to the mosque and even establishing familial links like 'Umar's marriage to Umm Kulthūm had been usual. This marriage was insisted by 'Umar and Imām agreed in spite of his early opposition. Not to mention, Imām married Abū Bakr's wife, that is Asmā', daughter of 'Umays to himself after Abū Bakr died and brought up Muḥammad, Abū Bakr's son in his house.

SHI'ISM DURING IMĀM'S CALIPHATE

Muslims' disagreements over caliphacy as well as other fields were dealt with in previous parts in detail. Now in the light of carrying out more precise researches, it is not fair of anyone to deny the existence of the 'Alawites and Quraysh parties in Messenger's time let alone denying it from Saqīfa on. al-Dūrī approves the two parties being present earlier than Saqīfa.[5] This

---

[1]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.II, p.281; al-Ghārāt, pp.110-111

[2]. Ṭāhā, verse 94; al-Muqni', p.109

[3]. Waq'at Ṣiffīn, p.91

[4]. Tafsīr al-manār, vol.VIII, p.224

[5]. Muqadama fī tārīkh Ṣadr al-islām, p.48

political disagreement which, from the very beginning, had a religious root, fomented the religious differences. For example, it was of great importance that initially, some companions considered merely Qur'ān as proof.In other words, not deeming the decrees of prophet as proof and prohibiting people from writing and quoting traditions did influence theology.'Abd al-Raḥmān Ibn 'Awf's laying it down that caliphate will be turned over to anyone accepting to act according to the conduct of Shiykhs, and Imām's stating that he will act only in accordance with his own individual reasoning, indicate the aggravation of religious differences.

As long as 'Umar was in power, the majority of people, excluding Imām's supporters, believed in rulership.

But when 'Uthmān, because of heretical religious deeds, was denied by a large number of companions, the problematic question was it that whose words should people regard as the religion and whom should they imitate.

Imām 'Alī replaced 'Uthmān. In the very beginning he was not accepted by the people of Damascus. Little by little, though temporarily, Baṣra went a different way as well. In Medina proper, though few, some companions balked at obeying or swearing allegiance to Imām. Apart from political issues, the important case was elucidating the religion especially in the case of differences or novel matters. Here two political and naturally religious parties began to emerge. The first group consisted of those having accepted Imām and deeming it necessary to obey him. The second group, motivated by 'Uthmān's oppressedness, didn't accept Imām's leadership and opposed him.

In this regard, Apostates and Deviators had no difference. At this point two terms, religious and political, were coined "'Alī's Shī'a and 'Uthmān's Shī'a" were gradually distinguished as respectively "Shī'a or al- Shī'a" and "Uthmānī or al-'Uthmāniyya".

Generally "Shī'a" was in opposition to "Uthmānī". But this title was not applicable to all individuals. There were some Shi'ite Muslims who were called so merely because they opposed 'Uthmān or stood for Imām as the Shi'istically legitimate caliph.

There were also some who regarded Imām as basically appointed by the Messenger and believed in a kind of divine right for his leadership.

Of course this doesn't necessarily mean that they should have refrained to cooperate with the early caliphs. Conditions being so, Imām himself had kept silent for Muslim interests and had repeatedly notified this point. What should be told about 'Uthmānids is that upholding the idea of Imām's illegitimacy, the Umayyads managed to dominate this view over a great part of Muslim community. But except for Baṣra, this opinion was not favored in Iraq. By contrast, in every appropriate accasion, the belief in 'Alawī's rightfulness emerged in the field of politics. Ḥidjāz also did not fully

surrender to the Umayyads, but tried to maintain another idea, content with Shiykhs. During the first to third century, religious and political changes triggered a great transition in that classification. Now, the matter related to our discussion is to show that the group known to us as Shi'ite Muslims did believe in 'Alī's divine designation. After swearing allegiance to 'Alī, Khuzayma Ibn Thābit said," We chose one whom God chose for us."[1]

In response to 'Umar who said, "Quraysh refrained from choosing 'Alī because they abominated both prophethood and caliphate being in my family."

Ibn 'Abbās replied, "They abominated what God had sent down."[2]

Opposing Mu'āwiya, Dārimiyya Ḥadjūniyya said, واليت عليًا على حبّه المساكين وإعطائه أهل السبيل وفقهه في الدين وبذله الحق من نفسه وما عقد له رسول الله من الولاية "He loved 'Alī because the Messenger confined the sainthood to him."[3]

According to Ṭabarī, once 'Alī returned to Kūfa from Ṣiffīn and Khāridjites parted with him, The Shi'ite Muslims remained with him saying that they are charged with another allegiance, نحن أولياء من واليت وأعداء من عاديت "We are amiable to your friends and opposed to your enemies."[4]

According to Iskāfī, the majority of people, based on the Book and tradition, and Imām's Shi'ite Muslims, on being amiable to the friends and enemies with the enemies, swore allegiance to 'Alī.[5]The emphasis on such an allegiance as the second allegiance and its content implies that allegiance-swearers tended toward Shī'a. In the original tradition, the emphasis is put on the allegiance of "'Alī's Shī'a". Abūdhar,passed away at 'Uthmān's time, called people toward the People of House and commemorated Prophet's family this way, ايها الناس! إن آل محمد هم الأسرة من نوح والآل من إبراهيم والصفوة والسلالة من إسماعيل والعترة الطيبة الهادية من محمد، فأنزلوا آل محمد بمنـــزلة الرأس من الجسد بل بمنـــزلة العينين من الرأس فانهم منكم كالسماء المرفوعة وكالجبال المنصوبة والشمس الضاحية وكالشجرة الزيتونة اضاء زيتها وبورك زندها "The family of Muḥammad(s), is the family of Noah and Ibraham and the selected progeny of Ismā'īl and saint posterity. Regard them as the head attached to body and the eyes attached to head, the high sky, firm mountains, shining sun and olive tree." Added he, "Muḥammad(s) is the heir of Adam, other prophets are not superior to him and 'Alī Ibn Abī Ṭālib is the legatee of him and the heir of his knowledge."

Addressing people he said," If you, the folk astounded after the Prophet had preferred whom God had preferred, deferred whom God had deferred

---

[1]. al-Mi'yār wa l-muwāzina, p.51

[2]. al-Īḍāḥ, p.88; Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, vol.XII, p.53

[3]. al-Wāfidāt min l-nisā' Alā Mu'āwīya, p.41

[4]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol. V, p. 64; Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol. II, p. 348

[5]. al-Mi'yār wa l-muwāzina, p. 194

and confined sainthood and heritage to the People of the House, you would have benefited from all blessings."[1]

Elsewhere Abūdhar has been quoted, "Oh, people! In case of being involved in prospective seditions, resort to Imām 'Alī and the Book.[2]When he was to be exiled to Rabaḍa and Imām and his children went to see him off, having a look at Imām, Abūdhar said, seeing you and your children reminds me of what Prophet told about you and makes me cry.[3]

Expressing regret for people not benefiting from Imām while he lives, Salmān said," I swear by God, after him, no one will inform you of the secrets of your Prophet."[4]Quoting the Messenger of God, Miqdād said, "knowing the family of Muḥammad(s) is the released from fire, loving his family is the pass from the Path and sainthood of his family is the security from chastisement.[5]'Ammār also narrated a tradition from the Messenger, I advice the one believing in God and admitting me with the guardianship of 'Alī, son of Abī Ṭālib, "Anyone loving 'Alī, loves me and anyone loving me, loves God."[6] There are lots of these quotations from Abūdhar, Salmān, 'Ammār, Miqdād indicating their Shi'istic beliefs. Abū Ḥātim Rāzī puts the definition of "Shī'a" this way," This is the title of those who loved 'Alī during the Messenger's time, for instance, Salmān, Abūdhar, Miqdād Ibn Aswad, 'Ammār Ibn Yāsir and etc.

Commenting on these four, The Messenger stated, "The Heaven looks forward to four men, Salmān, Abūdhar, Miqdād and 'Ammār.[7]

Describing 'Alī, Umm Sanān, the daughter of Khaythama Ibn Kharasha, composed this,

قدكنت بعد محمد خلفاً لنا أوصى إليك بنا فكنت وفيا

"Thou art Muḥammad's remainder to us, He made his will to thee about us and thou art the faithful."[8]

Inciting 'Alī's troops at Ṣiffīn,Umm al-Khayr said, هلموا رحمكم الله إلى الإمام العدل والتقي الوفي والصديق الوصي "May God bless thee. Hasten toward the sincere, pious and just successor."[9]

---

[1]. Nathr al-durr, vol. V, p. 77; Tārikh al-ya'qūbī, vol. II, p. 171

[2]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol. II, p. 118

[3]. Tārīkh al-ya'qūbī, vol. II, p. 173

[4]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol. II, p. 183

[5]. Sunan Ibn Mādja, vol. II, p. 1270; 3862

[6]. al-Muwāfiqiyyāt, p. 312; Dhakhā'ir al-'Uqbā, p. 95

[7]. Kitāb al-zīna, p. 259

[8]. al-Wāfidāt, p. 24

[9]. al-Wāfidāt, p. 29; Balāghāt al-nisā', p. 67; Tārīkh Dimashq, Tarādjim al-nisā', p.531

The point that Imām ‘Alī is regarded by these and many of his companions as “the Successor”, shows that they imagined him far beyond a caliph who has gained the caliphacy through public allegiance.

The sources contain lots of poems indicating the use of this comment by Ḥudjr Ibn ‘Adī, Ibn Tayyihān, Ibn ‘Idjlān and other Shi‘ites companions of Imām.[1]

Inviting the people to swear allegiance to ‘Alī, Mālik Ashtar stated, هذا وصيّ الأوصياء ووارث علم الأنبياء “O people! He is “the successor of the successors” and “The heir of Prophets’ knowledge.”[2]

In Ṣiffīn, he composed this,

من رآى عزة الوصيّ عليّ إنه في دجى الحنادس نور[3]

“Everyone knows ‘Alī, the chief successor, he is the very man who illuminates dark night.”

Lamenting over ‘Alī's martyrdom, Umm ‘Irbān said,

وكنا قبل مقتله بخير نرى مولى رسول الله فينا[4]

“We had a good life before he was killed because we stayed with the Messenger(s).”

A lot of poems composed by the Messenger's companions some of which were ‘Alī’s supporters, interpret Ghadīr tradition as sainthood and leadership. For instance, the poems of Qays Ibn Sa‘d Ibn

‘Ubāda, Ḥassān Ibn Thābit as well as Imām ‘Alī himself.[5] Qays Ibn Sa‘d composed this about Ghadīr:

وعـــليّ إمامـــنا وإمـــام لســـوانا أتى به التنـــزيل

---

[1]. Waq‘at Ṣiffīn, pp.18,23,24,46,381,385,416,436; Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, vol.I, pp.143-150; Mukhtaṣar Tārīkh Dimashq, vol.XI, p.229; al-Fuṣūl Mukhtāra, pp.217-218; See, Nahdj al-ṣabāgha,vol. III, p.p. 55-57; Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol. II, p.246; al-Futūḥ, vol.II, p.484; vol. III, pp.246,270 246,270

[2]. Tārīkh al-ya‘qūbī, vol. II, p. 179.

[3]. al-Futūḥ, vol. III, p. 226.

[4]. Maqtal al-imām al-Amīr al-Mu‘minīn (a), Ibn Abi l-Dunyā, Turāthunā Magazine,no.12; p. 126.

[5]. See, al-Ghadīr, vol. II, p.p. 25,34,78 from different sources, al-Muqni‘ fi l-Imāma, p.p. 75-76 and in the footnote of different sources. This has been quoted from Ḥassān, in Tārīkh al-ya‘qūbī (vol.II, p.128) and al-Muqni‘ (p.133) as well as other sources,

حفظت رسول الله فينا وعهده إليك ومن أولى به منك، من ومن
ألست اخاه في الاخاء ووصيه وأعلـــم فهرا بالكتاب وبالسنن

Thou safeguarded the Prophet ‘s religion left to thee. After all, who transcends thee in front of him. Are you not his brother and successor and not the most learned one of Banū Fahr about the Book ans Sunna.

يوم قال النبي من كنت مولا ه فهذا مولاه خطب جليل
انّ ما قاله النبيّ على الأمـ ة حتم ما فيـه قال وقيل [1]

"'Alī is our Imām and everyone's, he is the one who has introduced Qur'ān

It was on a great day when the Prophet(s) said, "'Alī is the lord of whomever I am his lord"

What the Prophet(s) said to Umma ends up all babbles"

Ḥassān Ibn Thābit also composed this one about the same,

يناديهـم يوم الغدير نبيهم بخـم واسمع بالرسول مناديا
فقال له قم يا علي فانني جعلتك من بعدي اماما وهاديا [2]

"Their Prophet called them to obey God at Ghadīr Khum, a great herald whose call must be heard

'Alī was told, "O rise up! For I placed thee an Imām after myself."

The combination of these quotations indicates the recognition of 'Alī as an Imām introduced by the Messenger. They regarded Imām's rightfulness in his legation on the part of Messenger and asked the others to follow him as the legatee of the Messenger.

According to Ibn Tayyihān, verily our Imām and guardian, is the legatee of the Messenger.

Ibn 'Idjlān used to say, "How possibly can we separate while the guardian is our Imām."[3]

According to Ḥudjr, the son of 'Adī, he is the guardian after the Messenger, and the prophet consented to his being the legatee.[4]

A newly converted man called Zādān Farrukh came upon Khāridjites on his way. They asked him about 'Alī, he said, "The Commander of the Faithful is the legatee of the Messenger and the lord of mankind".[5]

They killed him. In his well-known letter to Mu'āwiya, Muḥammad Ibn Abī Bakr mentioned Imām as وارث رسول الله ووصيه "The Heir of the Messenger and his successor."[6]

---

[1]. al-Ghadīr, vol. II, p. 68

[2]. al-Ghadīr, vol.II, p.34

[3]. Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, vol. I, p. 143,149

[4]. Ibid,vol. I, p. 145

[5]. al-Ghārāt, p. 123

[6]. Waq'at Ṣiffin, p.p. 118-119.for more uses of the word "Legation",see,Ma'ālim al-madrisatayn,vol.I,p.p.295-328

There is also a poem quoted from 'Ubayda Ibn Ṣāmit which is composed during Saqīfa.[1]

The measures taken by Imām for propagating the idea of "Divine leadership" are among the most important reasons of Shi'istic propagation and its distinction from his caliphate. He himself has composed a poem about the content of Ghadīr Tradition, in which he has interpreted the mentioned tradition as indicating the necessity of sainthood over people.

فأوجب لي ولايته عليكم رسول الله يوم غدير خم

"The Messenger(s) deemed his sainthood for you obligatory on the of Ghadīr Khum."[2]

In a lengthy letter to Mu'āwiya, Imām has explained this issue in detail. The letter contains significant points about Imām's contribution to the propagation of Shi'istic sainthood. Some major parts of the letter are quoted here for its great importance in terms of "Imamate Thought".

"The Almighty God says, "Obey God and execute the commands of the Messenger as well as Holders of Authority". This verse addresses us, The People of the House, not you. Then, Qur'ān forbade affray and disunity and ordered surrender and unity. You are the folk acknowledging God and his prophet and admitting them. God informed you that" Muḥammad(s) is the father of none of your men, he is the God's Messenger and the Seal of The Prophets "and also said, "Retreat if he is killed or dead ",and Mu'āwiya, you and your companion retreated, apostatized and broke your pledge to God as well as your allegiance, and all these will not harm God. Oh, Mu'āwiya! don't you know that Imāms are from among us not you. God informed you that Holders of Authority must be capable of deducing the knowledge and you must refer to God, his Messenger and Holders of Authority, the bearers of knowledge, in all that you disagree. So anyone keeping his pledge to God, shall find Him faithful to His promise. We are the family of Ibrāhīm envied by all and you are those who envy us. There was a party of Banū Isrā'īl who told their prophet, "Send us a king; we will fight for God's sake."[3]And when God sent Saul as a king for them, they envied him and said," How can he hold control over us?" [4]and deemed themselves more deserving of kingdom.These all are the past happenings and now we narrate them to you and their interpretation and esoteric exegesis are available to us, and anyone ascribing lies to us will fall into despair. You are typical of that... Let it be known to you that we, the People of House, are the envied family of Ibrāhīm. We were envied as our fathers were envied before.

---

[1]. al-Muqni' fi l-Imāma, p. 125.for more poems about the same, see, Ibid, pp. 126-127

[2]. al-Ghadīr, vol. II, p. 25 of Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, vol. II, p. 377; Tadhkirat al-khawāṣ, p. 62 and other sources

[3]. al-Baghara,/246

[4]. Ibid./247

The Almighty God said, "The family of Ibrāhīm, the family of Lot, the family of Jacob, the family of Moses, the family of Aaron and the family of David; we, too, are the family of our prophet, Muḥammad(s). "Oh, Mu'āwiya, don't you know that Allāh says, "The closest people to Ibrāhīm are those who follow him as well as this prophet and the believers, God is the believer's patron." [1] We are kins by blood cited in this verse,"The prophet merits more than the believers to themselves and his wives are the mothers of believers and according to the holy Qur'ān the genealogical relatives are merited over Muhādjirūn and Anṣār (Helpers)."[2]We are the People of House, God has chosen us "Nabuwwat", prophethood, is ordained to us the Book, wisdom and knowledge belong to us and Ka'ba and Ismā'īl's House and Ibrāhīm's abode belong to us. So we deserve sovereignty. Woe is to you Mu'āwiya. We are more deserving of Ibrāhīm, we are his family and the family of 'Imrān are more deserving of Him... and the family of Muḥammad(s) are more deserving of him...We are the people of house from whom God has removed all impurity.[3] Every prophet has an invitation exclusive to him, his progeny and family and every prophet leaves a testament for his family. Don't you know that Ibrāhīm gave his last testament to his son Jacob and when Jacob was due to die, he also left a will and Muḥammad(s) made a will.This was the tradition of Ibrāhīm and other prophets and Muḥammad(s) followed them by order of God. The Book is sent down to us and the Messenger has been raised up from among us and the verses have been read to us. We depend on, witness, call to and uphold the Book.Oh, Mu'āwiya! Do you seek another God but Allāh or another book except Allāh's Book? Or another Qibla but Ka'ba, the House of God, home of Ismā'īl and abode of our father, Ibrāhīm. Do you want another religion but that of Ibrāhīm or another sovereign and commander but God? God has placed this sovereignty and commandership in us.You revealed your animosity toward us, well showed your spite and jealousy and proved that you break your pledge to God and distort his verses as this one revealed to Ibrāhīm, "God has selected your religion for you."[4] Do you turn away from Ibrāhīm's religion while God has selected him in this world and he is from among the virtues in the Hereafter. Do you seek another decree but that of Allāh? Or another Imām not from our family? The leadership belongs to Ibrāhīm, his progeny and the believers who follow them and do not turn away from his religion. It was also said, anyone who follows me is from me."[5]

---

[1]. Āl Imrān,/68

[2]. al-'Aḥzāb/60

[3]. "Taṭhīr" verse, see, al-'Aḥzāb/33

[4]. al-Baghara/132

[5]. Ibrāhīm/36

Agitated at Imām's calling himself the relative of all prophets, Mu'āwiya wrote in response,

"Not content with your kinship with the Messenger, now you relate yourself to all the prophets. Beware that Muḥammad(s) was one of the prophets raised up for all, he delivered God's messages and had nothing more. Now tell us what is the merit of your kinship and the superiority of your right and where in the Book did you find your name? Wherein is your sovergnity, leadership and superiority mentioned?

Yes, you as well as us, follow the previous Imāms and caliphs."

Then he mentioned his being 'Uthmān's heir. Repelling him, Imām accused him of animosity toward the prophets and interest in his unbelieving forefathers and added,

"Beware that we are the People of Messenger's House. The infidel dislikes us and the believer bears us no grudge. You have denied Muḥammad's leadership and regarded him as Messenger not Imām. This denial makes you deny the leadership of all prophet's. But we testify that he was both Messenger and Imām. And about your denying my kinship with the Messenger and my right, verily our due and right is mentioned in the Holy Book, and God mentions us as having an equal share with the Prophet where he says," A fifth of anything that you acquire as spoils belongs to God, the Messenger and the relatives."[1] And elsewhere is said, "so give the relative his due."[2] Don't you see that our due is mentioned with that of God and Messenger and yours is mentioned with the strangers...you deny my leadership and sovereignty. Haven't you seen that in the Book, the almighty God says he has made the family of Ibrāhīm superior to the world.[3] He is God who has exalted us over all mortals.If you can, separate us from Ibrāhīm, Ismā'īl, Muḥammad(s) and his family, in the Holy Book.[4]

The aforesaid letter is quoted by Abū Isḥāq Thaqafī, a Shi'ites historian of the third century A.H.(283 A.D.) The belief in "divine leadership" of the Commander of the Faithful is completely obvious in the letter and different deductive aspects of it are outstanding. The most important part is the relation and link between prophethood, succession, and leadership as a noble course of action in the history of prophets. Mu'āwiya's denial of the Messenger's leadership is also remarkable in this letter. Anyhow,in his words, Imām has tried his very best in proving the superiority of "The People of House "over others and having a "divine right."

---

[1]. al-'Anfāl/ 41

[2]. Rūm/ 38

[3]. Referring to the Āl Imrān/ 33

[4]. al-Ghārāt, p.p. 67-71; al-Ghārāt, Urmawī, vol. I, p.p. 195-204

Proving such a right, Imām considers leadership as an integral part of it, to which the other caliphs are not entitled. There are also some other proofs indicating the Shi'istic thought in works handed down by Imām. In a sermon about the People of the House, Imām says, "They (the descendants of Muḥammad) are the trustees of his secret. Anyone taking refuge to them will be led towards God.They are the center of knowledge about him, the preachers of his religious commandments, the protectors of Qur'ān and Sunna, and mountain -like citadels which guard the religion and make the Islam stable, firm and powerful."[1]

Elsewhere he states, فأين تذهبون وأنى توفكون والأعلام قائمة والآيات واضحة والمنار منصوبة فأين يتاه بكم بل كيف تعمهون وبينكم عترة نبيكم وهم أزمة الحق وأعلام الدين وألسنة الصدق فأنزلوهم بأحسن منازل القرآن وردوهم ورود الهيم العطاش "Where are you going and when are you due to return? The landmarks are fixed, beacons are lighted and direction indicators are set up. To what extent are you being misled and confused? The descendants of the holy prophet(s) are amongst you. They are the reins of right, ensigns of faith and speakers in the language of truth. Place them in the best Qur'ānic positions turn to them as thirsty camels gather round water springs."[2]

"We are the tree of prophethood, the centers which receive the messages of God and descending place of blessing angels.

We are mines of knowledge and springs of wisdom. Our friend awaits blessings of God and our enemy awaits punishment and wrath." [3]

Elsewhere it is said, "Muḥammad's progeny revives the knowledge and kills the ignorance; you are informed of their knowledge because of their prudence, their appearance out of their inward, and their silence because of their philosophy of expression. They are neither at odds with the gospel truth nor render it wrong. They are pillars of religion and the shelter that harbor the people; upon their return, the gospel truth re-settled and the credal error, from there, was driven away and cut off with tongue. They knew, learned and applied the religion as they had to, not just lending an ear to it. Religion narrators are legion but its protectors are few in number."[4]

Elsewhere it has been stated, "Beware, when infant, my saint progeny is the most patient and when adult they are the most knowledgeable of all. Beware that we are from among the People of House whose knowledge and decree is rooted in God's knowledge and decree. In case, you follow us, you

---

[1]. Nahdj al-balāgha, Sermon 3; Rabi'al-abrār, vol. III, p. 536

[2]. Nahdj al-balāgha, Sermon 87

[3]. Ibid, sermon 109

[4]. Ibid, sermon 239

will be guided through our wisdom and if not, God will have you brought to ruin."

Elsewhere it goes to say, "They embarked on seas of sedition, adopted heresies and abandoned traditions. The faithful were isolated and wicked liars got loud in declaring their views. We are particular people, companions, the treasures of prophethood and the pearls of prophetic mission. Houses should be entered through their doors and whoever stepping into the house not through their doors should be called a thief. They are true applications of long Qur'ānic verses and treasures of beneficent Allāh; Once they speak, they tell naught but the truth and in case they remain quiet, they are not outpaced."[1]

Elsewhere he states this way, "Where are those, who falsely and unjustly deemed themselves and not us as the most knowledgeable. God raised us in position and kept them inferior to us. He has conferred on us the eminence of which he deprived them. He allowed us the entry to sphere of divine favor from which he dismissed them. With us guidance is to be sought and blindness (of misguidance) is to be changed into brightness. Verily Imāms are from among the Quraysh, the tree of which is planted in the family of Hāshim.The others do not deserve it nor would others be suitable as heads of affairs."[2]

In these sentences as well as the previously mentioned letter, a kind of prophetic inheritance for transfering the right of leadership is put forth by Imām. This is not the inheritance used for transferring the material rights but the one accompanied by executorship, knowledge, wisdom, purity and inerrancy.

This is the culture raised up by Qur'ān among prophets and the right Ibrāhīm wants for his progeny. God says," The despots never access to my mission." Despite the key role that "selection" plays, God considers the prophets as each other's descendants.[3]Treating it as an ordinary heritage The Sunnites accuse the Shi'ite Muslims of having such an idea about leadership while Shī'a approves of the text which is within the framework of divine heritage existing in Qur'ānic culture. In a letter indicating his dispute with Quraysh, Imām wrote about his being insistent on caliphacy, "Am I greedy to ask for my inheritance and the right granted to me by the Messenger and God?"[4] In this phrase, inheritance and divine right are cited together.

---

[1]. Nahdj al-balāgha,sermon 154

[2]. iIbid, semon 144

[3]. See, al-'An'ām/84-87;Āl Imran/38;Maryam/58;'Ankabūt /27;Ḥadīd/26

[4]. al-Ghārāt, p. 111

More important is Imām's reference to the Ghadīr tradition at the threshold of entering Kūfa- After suppressing those who broke their allegiance in the battle of Djamal. As several Sunnites sources specify, The people of Kūfa as well as Messenger's companions were brought together by Imām at the mosque of Kūfa and all those who had witnessed and heard the Messenger uttering the Ghadīr tradition were asked to stand up and give evidence of that. A large number, only twelve of which had participated the battle of Badr, bore witness.[1]Referring to this tradition publicly in fact implied his reference to "divine right "on "Sainthood".[2] The culture of "Proof" in Qur'ān confirms the leading attitude of Imām. This concept is applicable only to the prophet and those chosen by God and resembling them in rank.

Imām has stated, "God never allowed the creation to remain without a prophet deputed by Him or a Book sent down from Him or a binding argument."[3]

Elsewhere he said, "Verily the earth is never devoid of those who maintain God's binding argument either openly and reputedly or fearfully and secretly so that God's binding argument and proof should not be rebutted or his signs overlooked."[4]

In a letter to the one in charge of collecting alms, Imām included instructions for treating people and telling them, عباداللهٔ! أرسلني ولي الله وخليفته لآخذ منكم حق الله في أموالكم "O servants of God! The vicegerent of God and His caliph sent me to you for collecting God's share in your properties."[5]

The comments "The vicegerent of God and His caliph" Imām attributed to himself are totally Shi'istic concepts. Anyhow, having been formed during the caliphate of Imām, this theory constitutes the main identity of Shi'ites thought about Imamate.[6]During his caliphate, by referring to upcoming incidents entitled "Malāḥim wa Fitan" in various sermons, he turned out to be a figure not rivaling an ordinary caliph, he foretold the future but not as a political analyst. The charisma of Imām's personality in the eyes of gnostics and sufis, was deeply rooted in the conception leading the public to deem him deserving of "sainthood" in its full sense and also in

---

[1]. al-Ghadīr, vol. I, p. 66; from various Sunnites sources; see,. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol. II, p. 156

[2]. Facing Ṭalḥa in the battle of Djamal, Imām referred to this tradition;Tārīkh Dimashq, vol. XI, p. 204

[3]. Nahdj al-balāgha, Sermon 1

[4]. Ibid, sayings, No. 147

[5]. Ibid, letter 25

[6]. Shī'a believes that this theory was at issue in Prophet's time.

remarks and conducts of him who officially claimed to be omniscient and asked all people to question him before they miss him.[1]

At the end of these proofs, it will be proper to mention another important narration. When ʻĀyisha was ready to revolt against ʻAlī, the Messenger's graceful wife, Umm Salama, tried to stop her going.

ʻAbd Allāh Ibn Zubayr said objectingly, "You harbor old animosity towards the family of Zubayr."

Umm Salama answered, "Do you think people will turn to Ṭalḥa and your father while ʻAlī about whom God said, عليّ ولّي كل مؤمن ومؤمنة "'Alī is the guardian of all believing men and women" is present.

ʻAbd Allāh said, "We haven't heard him saying such a thing."

Umm Salama replied, "You may have not, but your aunt, ʻĀyisha, has."

I myself heard the Messenger saying, عليّ خليفتي عليكم في حياتي ومماتي فمن عصاه فقد عصاني "Alive or dead, I place ʻAlī as my caliph to you, so whoever disobeys him, he has disobeyed me." ʻĀyisha has also confirmed this.[2] Based on things mentioned, what should be said about the interpretation of comments written in Nahdj al-Balāgha on the allegiance of Muhādjirūn and Anṣār is that at that time, the allegiance of these two was the principle behind selecting a caliph, and Imām enjoyed this principle. Facing the opposition of deviators and apostates Imām had to refer to this principle. With this deduction of Imām lots of people followed him and fought his enemies. There is a poem quoted from one of Imām's adherents who compared his pledge to that of early caliphs to prove his rightfulness and public commitments to him,

له في رقاب النـــاس عهد وذمـــة كعهد ابي حفص وعهد ابي بكر
فبايع ولا ترجع علي العقب كافراً أعـــيذك بالله العزيز من الكفر[3]

"People owe him just as ʻUmar and Abū Bakr do. So swear an allegiance and avoid infidelity, do you excuse yourself in atheism!"

But neither Imām considered this as a legitimate way of leadership nor did his close companions who deemed his leadership far beyond the allegiance of Muhādjirūn and Anṣār, accept such a basis. In conclusion, the differences from Saqīfa to the martyrdom of Imām have been influential in many of the Islamic thoughts, But related to our discussion are issues concerning ruler ship and caliphate.

Here, a brief conclusion is drawn from the effects these events had on forming of political views. Obviously, as mentioned earlier, in the course of

---

[1]. See Nahdj al-saʻāda fī Mustadrak Nahdj al-balāgha, vol. II, p.p. 314,627

[2]. al-Futūḥ, vol. II, pp. 282-283

[3]. Waqʻat Ṣiffīn, p. 46

murdering 'Uthmān and 'Alī's caliphacy, Shi'ism changed both in quality and quantity. Previous to this, only a few companions tended towards Shī'a but because of aforesaid reasons it spread in Iraq. This trend is called "'Alawites and Shi'ites". Its full version can be regarded in 'Uthmān's rejection and the proof of 'Alī's caliphate.The full version of it includes 'Alī's Imamate after the Messenger and his superiority over the other caliphs. There has been some controversy over the quality and quantity of some exaggerated trends emerging at that time.[1]

The other trend was called "'Uthmānids". This trend was crystallized during to wars of Djamal and Ṣiffīn.The aforesaid course of action came to a dead end in Djamal but its impacts on Baṣra remained to be seen and the people of that city were reckoned as "'Uthmānids".[2]The second trend prevailed over Damascus and Iraq during the Umayyads. The Umayyads ruling was the manifestation of 'Uthmānīds sect's prevalence. This sect deemed no legitimacy for 'Alī's caliphacy on the pretext of the third caliph being murdered either by 'Alī himself or at his instigation. They also said not all of the people had approved of him. This has been a common belief among the ancestors of Sunnites who were called the 'Uthmānids. During that period "Shi'ite Muslims" and "'Uthmānids" were opposed to each other. The 'Uthmānids believed that 'Uthmān was to replace Mu'āwiya in caliphate. Their legitimacy was based on Mu'āwiya 's claim to be a relative of 'Uthmān and consequently his blood-wit.[3] Baṣra and Kūfa, tending towards 'Uthmānids and Shī'a respectively, were rivals to each other. The distinction between Shi'ism and 'Uthmānī's sect was the interesting point about the battle of Djamal.

The murderer of one of Imām's companions called Zayd Ibn Ṣūḥān said he had killed him while he believed in 'Alī.

Opposing 'Ammār he composed this:

لا تبرح العرصة يا بن اليثربي حتى اقاتلك على دين علي[4]

"O Yathrib-born! Leave not the battlefield so that I might fight you by relying on 'Alī's religion."

"'Uthmān's religion" was coined versus "'Alī's religion". A poet from Damascus, told about the Damascus army:

ثمانين الف "دين عثمان" دينهم كتائب فيها جبرئيل يقودها[5]

---

[1]. See Ibn Abī Dunyā,, Maqtal al-imām Amīr al-Mu'minīn,,p.92

[2]. This has been stated about Baṣra, قطعة من الشام نزلت بيننا Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā,vol.VI,p.333

[3]. al-Ghārāt,p.70

[4]. al-Djamal,p.346

[5]. al-Djamal, p. 346

"80 thousands are those whose religion is that of 'Uthmān's, troops who are led by Gabriel."

A poet participating in Ṣiffīn, introduced himself this way,

انا ابن ارباب الملوك غسان والدائن اليوم به دين عثمان[1]

"I am son of king of kings and today I follow 'Uthmān's religion."

In a poem Rufā'a Ibn shaddād told,

انا ابن شداد على "دين علي" لست لعثمان بن اروى بولي[2]

"I am Ibn Shaddād, a follower of 'Alī's religion and never am I guardian of 'Uthmān Ibn 'Arwā."

It has been said that 80 thousand of Damascus army believed in "'Uthmān's religion ".[3] There was also a third trend, in addition to Shī'a and 'Uthmānī, called "Qā'idīn". Nāshi' Akbar recognizes this group in two different names and trends. The first one was "Ḥulaysiyya" who believed that when a sedition is raised one must stay around his/her house.

They deemed both groups as misled and infernal.To them religion was seen as tarry to war and sedition as getting involved in it. 'Abd Allāh Ibn 'Umar, Muḥammad Ibn Maslama and Sa'd Ibn Abī Waqqāṣ belonged to this group. They believed that only one of the two groups was right but the righteous group was unknown to them. Abū Mūsā Ash'arī, Abū Sa'īd Khudrī and Abū Mas'ūd Anṣārī were from among this group.

As... Nāshi' Akbar clarifies,these were called "Mu'tazilites". Later, Wāṣil Ibn 'Aṭā' and 'Amr Ibn 'Ubayd also thought the same about Ṭalḥa and Zubayr.[4]Considering the situation of that time, these groups put the emphasis on the concept of "Sedition", to them, being "'Abd Allāh, the murdered" was preferable to being "'Abd Allāh, the murderer".[5]

PEOPLE'S ALLEGIANCE TO 'ALĪ (A)

Without doubt, during the caliphacy of the first three caliphs, Imām was not politically active in the current affairs and except for counseling some Judicial cases and, to a lesser extent political issues, did not take an active part in politics. In other words, he did not take part in the ruling system of caliphs, but just led the opposition party indirectly. His victory after

---

[1]. Tārīkh Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol. V, p. 43

[2]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol. V, p. 233

[3]. Tārīkh Dimashq, vol. VIII, p. 52

[4]. Masā'il al-imāma, p.p. 16-17; See, Murdji'a, Tārīkh wa Andīshih, 19-26; al-zīna, p. 273; Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol. V, p.p. 57-58

[5]. Masā'il al-imāma,p.16

'Uthmān, in large measures, indicated the domination of anti-Quraysh and anti-Umayyads. These opponents enjoyed the support of Iraqi tribes, Egyption migrants and also the assistance of Anṣār and native Medinans.Some of Muhādjirūn at the head of which was 'Ammār Ibn Yāsir, were reckoned among this group. These formed a part of 'Uthmān's adversaries. But because of 'Uthmān's being inattentive to a group of Quraysh itself and his overattention to Umayyads, the former had also joined the opposition party. Ṭalḥa, Zubayr and 'Āyisha were presiding over this group. 'Amr Ibn 'Āṣ who was deposed from Egyptian rule, opposed 'Uthmān. Of course all these claimed that 'Uthmān had stood aloof from the practice of Prophet. Therefore the overall direction of the rebellion was returning to the Prophet's conduct, fostering justice and not being cruel or unjust to people. The head companions who had lived up to that time, and participated in 'Umar's election council- especially Ṭalḥa who was supported by 'Āyisha were candidates for caliphate. Their joining to the opposition party was a glimmer of hope for caliphate. Despite their fame in Iraq and Hidjāz, concerning records, knowledge and piety none of them could hold a candle to 'Alī; moreover, 'Uthmān's failure as the representative of Quraysh naturally resulted in the power of 'Alī, the representative of the opposition party who had opposed the ruler's policy from the very beginning.[1]

From the starting-point of public opposition to 'Uthmān, Imām 'Alī (a) was as the mediator of the two parties or on the other hand, opponents' spokesman and he transferred people's oppositions to 'Uthmān. Although being considered as the mediator, Imām (a) acted moderately. Having objected to 'Uthmān's some indecent behaviors[2], Imām (a) under the conditions of being mediator obeyed 'Uthmān's rights, took him on oath of promise and calm opponents along with obeying opponents' conditions. It was natural that although Imām (a) didn't play any role in 'Uthmān's murder and his coming to power, the Umayyads and some parties of Quraysh accused him of doing so. In spite of it, most of those being of Imām's close companions ranked among the opponents and even being accused of having a hand in 'Uthmān's murder. Imām's supporters were all anti-'Uthmān. And as indicated before, this was the starting-point of Shi'ism forming among people of Kūfa whose important political activity was opposition to the ruling caliphate. They were indeed satisfied with Abū Bakr and 'Umar.

---

[1]. From fabricated narrations in Tārikh al-ṭabarī

[2]. Sa'īd Ibn Musayyib said, "I witnessed 'Alī (s)'s rebel contention and that of Uthmān until Uthmān wanted to scourge 'Alī (a) and I caused them to make up with each other. See Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol. IV, p.132, No.112

At any rate, Imām's supporting party consisting of Anṣār, the majority of companions as well as Kūfa's Qur'ān reciters was strong to the extent that Ṭalḥa and Zubayr weren't allowed any appearance. Also there existed no reference to Sa'd Ibn Abī Waqqāṣ[1]. In continuation of Sa'īd Ibn Musayyib's long narrations concerning 'Uthmān's murder, it's mentioned that after that 'Alī (a) came to his house and all the people rushing to his house asserted 'Alī (a)'s caliphate.

They wanted him to reach out his hand to people for allegiance but Imām (a) said, "Allegiance is Badr's companions' not yours. And the caliph is the one they choose."

After that, all the people of Badr who were alive came to 'Alī (a) and called for allegiance to Imām (a).[2]

Confronted by the insistence of the Prophet(s)'s companions, Imām averted the admission of caliphate. Ṭabarī quoted from Muḥammad Ibn Ḥunayf that after 'Uthmān's murder, a number of companions came to my father, saying that we know no body more deserving of caliphate than you.

'Alī (a) said, "It's better for me to be your vizier rather than your emir".

They answered, "We admit nothing but swearing allegiance to you."[3]

Imām said that his allegiance ought to be in mosque rather than in secrecy.

According to Ibn 'Abbās, "I feared lest a problem might be arisen in the mosque."[4] When he went to the mosque, Muhādjirūn and Anṣār went there and pledged allegiance to him. Besides, Abū Bashīr 'Ābidī has been quoted as saying that after the assassination of 'Uthmān, the people went repeatedly to 'Alī (a) till they managed to compel him admit the caliphate.

Imām ascended the pulpit and said, "He was not in want of caliphate and he admitted it reluctantly, and shall accept to govern them providing that people will adhere thoroughly to him."

It's been noted in the narrations that Ṭalḥa and Zubayr were within this throng of the people as well. When all gathered in the mosque, Ṭalḥa was the first to swear allegiance. Averting allegiance, Sa'd Ibn Abī Waqqāṣ said that he won't swear allegiance as well. Ṭabarī points out a narration with

---

[1]. Sa'īd in the conflict of arbitration claimed that no one but he is of superior quality in caliphate, for having no hand in Uthmān's murder and the recent seditions. See Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol. II, p. 344

[2]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, al-Djuz' al-rābi', pp.559-560, No.1419

[3]. Tārikh al-ṭabarī, vol. IV, p. 429; see Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol. II, p. 219

[4]. In Iskāfī's narration it's been cited, I was afraid that some of the ignorants might say something in mosque or the ones who have lost their own fathers or uncles in the Prophet's Maghāzī might object, al-Mi'yār Wa l-Muwāzina, p.50

respect to the belief that Ṭalḥa and Zubayr's allegiance arose from their fear of Mālik's sword. However, the narration is not in conformity with the other ones. Imām asked them to be caliph themselves, and he shall swear allegiance to them. Yet, in so far as, by no means, they found themselves apt, they were satisfied with swearing allegiance to Imām, in order that they hereby find a position for themselves. By chance, their later remarks made it known that by compelled allegiance they meant that they didn't have anybody at Medina to whom they swear allegiance, whereas Imām 'Alī (a) has had abundant number of supporters.

Previously, in our discussion on allegiance, we've pointed out that, in principle, Imām was among those compelling others to swear allegiance. As after the riot of Djamal rebels, he never forced Marwān to swear allegiance as quoted by him.[1]

Immediately after allegiance Imām was asked to turn over Baṣra and Kūfa but he refused to do so.

Muḥammad Ibn Ḥanīfa says, "All Anṣārs except a few, swore the oath of allegiance to 'Alī. The opponents consisted of Ḥassān Ibn Thābit, Ka'b Ibn Mālik, Maslama Ibn Mukhallad, Muḥammad Ibn Maslama and some others reckoned among the 'Uthmānids, 'Abd Allāh Ibn 'Umar, Zayd Ibn Thābit and Usāma Ibn Yazīd were among non-Anṣār opponents who all benefited from generosity of 'Uthmān's caliphate.

Ṭabarī says, "As far as we know, not even one of Anṣārs infringed the allegiance to 'Alī.[2]Hence, some, who allegedly did not swear allegiance to 'Alī were probably those not taking part in battles of Djamal, Ṣiffīn and Nahrawān not those not taking the oath of allegiance to 'Alī.[3] As Diyār Bakrī relates, All the Badr participants who had lived up to that time swore allegiance to 'Alī.[4]'Abd al-Raḥmān Ibn Abzī has been quoted, 800 of us who were present at Riḍwān allegiance, took part at Ṣiffīn 63 of whom including 'Ammār were killed.[5] As Ibn A'tham narrates, at first Imām rejected the allegiance saying, "I beheld in everything a profound disintegration which neither hearts can stand nor intelligence can accept."

---

[1]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.II, p.263

[2]. See, Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol. IV, p.p. 427-431; about Imām's conversation with Ṭalḥa see, p. 434; about Ṭalḥa and Zubayr's demanding the ruler ship of Kūfa and Baṣra see, Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol. II, p. 218

[3]. Herein some other evidence will be mentioned. According to Ya'qūbī, All people took the oath except three of Quraysh one of whom swore the oath thereafter. See, Tārīkh al-ya'qūbī, vol. II, p.p. 178-179

[4]. Tārīkh al-khamīs, vol. II, p. 261. About the allegiance of Muhādjirūn and Anṣār see, al-Djamal, p.p. 102-110

[5]. Tārīkh Khalīfa Ibn Khayyāṭ, p. 196

Then, accompanied by people, he went to Ṭalḥa and asked him to accept the caliphate.

Ṭalḥa said, "There is no one more deserving than you."

The same happened to Zubayr and both of them undertook not to do anything contrary to Imām's will.[1]

Ibn A'tham talks about the role of Anṣār in taking the oath of allegiance to 'Alī and about their deputies who addressed the people in the mosque some of whom where Iraqi and Egyptian migrants.

People said," You are "God's helpers" and we will do what you say."

They too introduced 'Alī as the caliph and the cheering people approved him as well. That day people left the mosque and next day Imām entered the mosque and said, choose someone that fits your purpose and I shall follow you.

They said, "We haven't changed our mind since yesterday."

At first, Ṭalḥa who was paralyzed in hand took the oath. This was considered as ill omen! Then Zubayr took the oath and following him Muhādjirūn and Anṣār and all Arabs, non-Arabs and kinsfolk present in Medina did so.[2]Imām's words, better than anything else, are expressive of why he refused to accept the burden of people's allegiance. The first reason was that to him, the society was so decadent that he couldn't either lead it or enforce his criterion and intentions.On the day of allegiance he told,

"Leave me alone and go in search of someone else. We are facing a matter with several faces and colors, which neither hearts can stand nor intelligence can accept The clouds of sedition have darkened the skies thoroughly and the right path can't be discerened. Let it be known to you that if I accept your request I shall make you act according to my own judgments and will not care about the suggestions and blames of the reproachful."[3]

Imām knew that amidst those seditions, leading the society properly was beyond the bounds of possibility. Once he got that people won't leave him to himself, he managed to place them under the obligation of obeying him fully and resigning themselves to his will.[4] Following happenings made the hardships of working within sedition and doubts dawn on Imām. Once he

---

[1]. These two were also tied to seizing caliphate and Ṭalḥa was supported by 'Āyisha. Balādhurī states, When 'Uthmān was murdered, 'Āyisha was on her way from Mecca to Medina. Hearing about people swearing allegiance to Ṭalḥa she cheered up, but being informed of 'Alī's caliphate, she returned to Mecca and declared she would take revenge for 'Uthmān, Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol. II, p. 213.

[2]. al-Futūḥ,vol.II.p.p.243-245

[3]. Nahdj al-balāgha, sermon 92

[4]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī,vol. IV,p.428

said, "If I knew the heightened situation, I would have never got involved in it from scratch."[1] Later on, he wrote about the day of allegiance,

"When you revolted against 'Uthmān and killed him, turning toward me you wanted to swear allegiance to me. I balked at doing so and held my hand back. You struggled to open my hand and I prevented it. You pulled my hand and I resisted. You crowded so densely round me that I thought you will either kill each other or me, you said" we swear allegiance to you for we find no one but you and will consent to no one except you and after the allegiance we will neither get separated nor will there be in any disagreement between us." so I felt compelled to accept your request and called the people to take the oath of allegiance. I accepted the allegiance of any one swearing at will.Not taking aversion to the one not willing to take the oath, I left him to himself. Ṭalḥa and Zubayr were from among those swearing allegiance to me and if they didn't want to do so, I would compel neither them nor any one else."[2]

Once, in Kūfa, Imām saw a man called Abū Maryam from whom he asked the reason for his coming there.

He answered," I have come for my promise to you because you said if you had come to power, you would have done so and so."

Imām said, "I have kept my word, but I am in grips with the most malignant people who do not obey me at all."[3]

There are some significant points about 'Alī's election as the Community leader. First, people's participation in the first Caliph's election was initially confined to the participants in Saqīfa and evidence shows some sort of previous conspiracy or at least coordination of anti-Hāshimites party earlier than allegiance.[4] 'Umar was appointed through a will and 'Uthmān, too,was selected by a confined council. By contrast, 'Alī's election was largely demanded by Medinans.

As a matter of fact, this was the only allegiance and election which can be called a public one. The new point about this allegiance was the participation of Iraqi and Egyptian delegates in addition to Muhādjirūn and Anṣār. Of course, based on the common, well-establishd tradition of those days, according to which only Muhādjirūn and Anṣār were of good standing, no credence was attached to their choice. Despite of that, their presence did

---

[1]. Ansāb al-ashrāf,vol.II,p.213

[2] al-Ghārāt, p. 112

[3] Akhbār al-Buldān, Ibn Faqīh Hamadānī, pp. 4-5 (Sezgin publication)

[4] 'Abd al-Aziz al-Dūrī denies Lammens's belief considering Saqīfa as the result of Abū Bakr,'Umar and Abū 'Ubayda's conspiracy but confirms the former agreement of Anti-Hāshimites party. Muqadama fi tārikh Ṣadr al-islām,p.56.

increase public turnout in Imām's election. This was not an unknown phenomenon for Imām and the others. During a sermon Imām said,

Your allegiance to me was not a hasty and precipitate action nor is my and your position the same. I seek you for Allāh's sake and you seek me for your own benefits.[1]

This, according to Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd[2] is an allusion to Abū Bakr's election. In order to prevent the idea of opportunism and conspiracy in public opinion, Imām didn't allow people to take the oath at his house, stating that, "There can be no allegiance without Muslim's consent.[3] The allegiance should not take place secretly. I go to the mosque, anyone who wishes can come there to take the oath to me." Then he entered the mosque and people took the oath to him. [4]This is one of the reasons of Imām's delay in accepting people's request.

Secondly, Apart from what was set forth about Imām and his true Shi'ite Muslims' belief in his Imamate, the "tradition of allegiance" was fully established and Imām could not trespass it. This was a good proof against Imām's opponents and for him who was publicly selected. According to Dīnwarī, during a speech following allegiance Imām stated, "Oh, people! You took the oath of allegiance to me in accordance with the previous traditions. Prior to the allegiance, the choice was yours but after that you have no choice. Imām must be firm and the folk must resign themselves to his will. This was a public allegiance, anyone denying it, has in fact denied Islam, allegiance to me was not precipitate.[5]

Notwithstanding, Imām was determined not to force anyone to take the oath. He even didn't call to account those who had sworn the oath but were inattentive in settling the case of apostates. When Sa'd Ibn Abī Waqqāṣ, 'Abd Allāh Ibn 'Umar, Muḥammad Ibn Maslama and Usāma Ibn Zayd made some excuse for not performing Imām's command, Mālik Ashtar said, "Oh, the Commander of the Faithful! Although we are not from among the Muhādjirūn and Anṣār but we are from "The followers of righteousness".[6] Despite Muhādjirūn and Anṣār's superiority in Islam, they are not supreme in what they share with us. This has been a public allegiance, anyone going back upon it deserves to be reprimanded. Coax those who intend to violate the allegiance and imprison them in case they refuse.

---

[1] Nahdj al-balāgha, Sermon 136

[2] Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, vol. IX, p. 31

[3] Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol. IV, p. 427

[4] Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol. II, p. 210

[5] Akhbār al-ṭiwāl, p. 140; See, al-Mi'yār wa l-muwāzina, p. 105

[6] This refers to the verse 100,Mu'minūn

Imām stated, "I call them but they are decided in their very votes."[1]

Ḥasan and Ḥusayn told their father," Marwān –who after 'Uthmān's murder, had sworn allegiance and now was taken into captivity in the battle of Djamal – will take the oath to you."

Imām answered, "Did he not swear me allegiance after 'Uthmān's murder? I don't need the allegiance of such a treacherous person with a hand like that of Jews.[2]

According to Balādhurī, following Djamal, Marwān told 'Alī (a), "Unless forced, I won't swear allegiance to you." [3]

Obviously, not taking the oath differs form rebelling. Once according to the accepted standards the oath is taken and the public allegiance is accomplished anyone disobeying rebelliously or claiming caliphate, must be restrained;otherwise, what the caliphate would mean?[4] Despite this, Imām gloried in not forcing anyone to take the oath to him.[5]

'Adī Ibn Ḥātim also told Mu'āwiya, "'Alī (a) compelled no one to take the oath."[6]

The third point is that the accepted method of allegiance, was that of Muhādjirūn and Anṣār based on which, Imām was nationally accepted as the caliph and apostates were rejected.[7] Even it has been said that even if Imām were the one killing 'Uthmān, he remains the caliph, for Muhādjirūn and Anṣār who dominate over people have taken the oath of allegiance to him.[8] Obviously, Imām relied on this method with the purpose of convincing his opponents who, based on the same method, approved Muhādjirūn and Anṣār and the legitimacy of previous caliphs. Not to mention that in addition to Muhādjirūn and Anṣār, the delegates from Iraqi tribes and some Egyptians had also sworn allegiance to 'Alī (a), and this point was taken into

---

[1] Akhbār al-ṭiwāl, p. 143 See, al-Mi'yār wa l-muwāzina, p. 106

[2] Nahdj al-balāgha, Sermon 73.

[3] Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol. II, p. 262.

[4] In a letter to Mu'āwīya, Imām wrote,...and now the fact about deeming yourself different from Ṭalha and Zubayr is that there exists no difference between you. Because mine has been a "public allegiance" to which no body disagreed. So necessarily it is to be accepted by all. Waq'at Ṣiffīn, p. 58.

[5] al-Mi'yār wa l-muwāzina, p. 52; al-Djamal, p. 131.This has been stated in the first letter in Nahdj al-balāgha,"People swore me allegiance freely and willingly." Trying to emphasize the role of Mālik, 'Uthmānids and Umayyads intend to prove that people took the oath for fear of him.

[6] Waq'at Ṣiffīn, p. 65.

[7] Ibid, p. 16

[8] Ibid, p.45

consideration by Mālik Ashtar.[1] In a letter to Mu'āwiya Imām wrote, "Those who took the oath of allegiance to Abū Bakr, 'Umar and 'Uthmān, have sworn allegiance to me in the same way." Now he who was present at the election have no right to go back upon his oath and he who was absent has no right to deny the oath of participants. Consultation is confined to Muhādjirūn and Anṣār.God feels satisfaction at they gathering round a man and selecting him as their caliph. Should anybody go against such decision or fall into heresy, they will return him to the position from where he kept away and should he refuse to fall in line with others, then war is the only course left open to be adopted against him.[2]

As far as the initial caliphs were in power, this was deemed as an acceptable principle, except for the time when some 'Uthmānids relied on a few companions not swearing the oath and they also, making an excuse of Muslims fratricide, evaded to act in obedience to the orders of 'Alī (a) in combating his enemies.[3] Mu'tamir Ibn Sulaymān narrated, "I told my father, people say the allegiance to 'Alī (a) was not accomplished. He answered, "My son, allegiance belongs to the people of Mecca and Medina who did take the oath."[4]

Another point is that on what allegiance was sworn. 'Uthmān was recognized as outcast because he violated divine rules and in early caliphs time, it was an acceptable principle to act upon the Book and the Prophet's tradition. Although a few of them disregarded some dimensions of the Prophet's biography and even Qur'ān, after 'Umar, condition of Shiykhs biography was included in allegiance that Imām 'Alī rejected. According to Ṭabarī, swearing allegiance to 'Alī happened to say that Book of God has to be referred about the close, the mean, the endeared and the stranger.[5] This position reflects issues during 'Uthmān.

An Egyptian, Ibn A'tham says, named Sūdān Ibn Ḥamrān Murādī who is to be murderer of 'Uthmān said, "O Abū Ḥasan! we swear allegiance to you provided that if you acted like 'Uthmān,you'll be killed".

That's right, replied 'Alī (a), then people acted according to Book of God and the Prophet's tradition.[6]

One person insisted on including Shiykhs biography as terms of allegiance in addition to above two, yet Imām disapproved and saying that

---

[1] Akhbār al-ṭiwāl, p. 143, No.10.

[2] Nahdj al-balāgha, Letter 6

[3]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol. II, p. 207.

[4]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol. II, p.208

[5]. Tārikh al-ṭabarī, vol.IV, p.435

[6]. al-Futūḥ, vol.II, pp.246-247

even if Abū Bakr and 'Umar act upon something except the Book and the tradition, they are untruthful.[1]

Imām merely found himself yielded to Qur'ān and tradition and unwilling to disobey it and so were his companions and commanders.

O people!, said Qays Ibn Sa'd, we swore allegiance to a man better of whom we never know after the Prophets(s). Rise up and swear allegiance to the Book and His Prophet.If we failed to do so, allegiance is withdrawn.[2] Muḥammad Ibn Abī Bakr, Egyptian ruler said if you observe in my deeds obedience and fear from God, I praise God because of this gift bestowed upon me and it has guided me. If not, I have to be scolded.[3] Imām himself disapproved those who wanted to condition the allegiance to make Imām overlook what they have in their hands and said the only right they have in front of him is to comply with the Book and the tradition and nothing else.[4]

Qā'idīn and No Congregation Formation

There emerged no agreement like that of Shiykhs time in the course of swearing allegiance to Imām and despite allegiance of the Anṣār and Muhādjirūn. A few people opposed in the course of allegiance to Abū Bakr but congregation formed since, later, opponents also swore allegiance. Then, 'Umar claimed that the opponents must join "congregation". This congregation faced no problems in time of 'Umar. It wasn't first time when a rebellion shaped in time of 'Umar and congregation split apart. 'Uthmān's improper attitude led to fragmentation in the Islamic community. In that time Kūfiyāns and a major part of Egyptians found 'Uthmān a wrongdoer if not willing to kill him, they didn't know him to be qualified for caliphate either. This idea wasn't strongly rooted in Kūfa and 'Uthmān was never admitted by people. Later on, it wasn't known that if anyone wants martyrdom, he shall go to Dār al-Bittīkh in Kūfa for compassion of 'Uthmān.[5] Medinans were hesitant about this and they are said to be followers of Abū Bakr and 'Umar. They never approved 'Uthmān.

There were people of Damascus and Umayyads who retained sanctity of 'Uthmān and founded "'Uthmānids"[6], recalled as "anti-Shī'a religion". As a matter of time, the Sunnites approved 'Uthmān. From third century on, the 'Uthmānids with a gradual change of name into people of Sunnat and Djamā'at approved 'Alī (a). Anyway, "Djamā'at" persisted till 'Umar and up

---

[1]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.V, p.76

[2]. al-Ghārāt, p.75

[3]. Ibid. p.83

[4]. Tarīkh al-ya'qūbī, vol.II, pp.178-179

[5]. Tārīkh Yaḥyā Ibn Mu'ayn, vol.II, p.238

[6]. This sect was also called" Sufyāniya","Nābita" and" Nawāṣib".

to mid-rule of 'Uthmān[1] and broke up into branches. This congregation in a real sense ceased to return until Mu'āwiya that strangled all opposition by force and trick. However, it is obvious that the congregation differed from that of the old one foundationally. Allegiance to Imām 'Alī met the requirements of a proper one. Muhādjirūn and Anṣār in addition to emissaries of Iraq and Egypt swore allegiance to him. But due to disagreements continued by Qā'idīn, the wicked ones, the deviators and the apostates and that a full-scale congregation came not to be formed, the subject congregation wasn't so legitimate in the eyes of the majority of the companions through support of which the disagreements can be challenged and their founders can be called "rebels". This wasn't accepted by the Sunnites save the basis of the mentioned rebellions on the part of the companions that wasn't regarded as "Idjtihād", exertion, and so they were exonerated. They didn't analyze the Khāridjites this way calling them real rebels. The "legitimate congregation" resisted against "rebellion" through support of a Qur'ānic verse in the chapter of Hidjrat that says, "If two groups of the faithful began to fight each other, try to bring them to a compromise. And if one offended the other, try to fight the offender to bring it back to bow to God. If it did so, make a just peace between them and exert justice for God love just people".[2]

If, Abū Ḥanafiyya said later, Amīr al-Mu'minīn(a) had no conduct of Djihād with the rebels, we didn't know the rules of fighting with them.[3]

The Commander of the Faithful held that the mere swearing no allegiance and even expressing dissent verbally can not justify armed campaigning against them. The first disagreement came from Qā'idīn, those who likely swore allegiance to 'Alī but refrained from helping him in his war with the Infidels and the Deviators. Balādhurī narrates that they didn't swear allegiance.

Some of such as 'Abd Allāh Ibn 'Umar said that they will be the last people to swear allegiance.[4]

These people believed that "congregation" is not organized.

Sa'd Ibn Abī Waqqāṣ said, "I will swear allegiance when I'm the last one".[5]

---

[1].Al-Risālat al-nābita dar Rasā'il al-Djāḥiẓ (al-Rasā'il al-kalāmiyya),p.239

[2]. al-Ḥudjurāt, verse,9

[3].Sharḥ Uṣūl al-Khamsa, p.141; al-Baḥr al-rā'iq, vol.VI, pp.151,153; Aḥkām al-qur'ān, Djaṣṣāṣ, vol.III, p.400, Djawāhir al-kalām, vol.XXI,p.332

[4]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.II, p.207

[5]. Ansāb al-Ashrāf, vol.II, p.207; Iskāfī says that they said that they accept allegiance but they resent to war with the people of prayer. In return, Imām said, "Abū Bakr

Imām left them alone in front of these oppositions. Here it is to be noted that there must be a distinction between the particular and general allegiance when a forcible allegiance is in question. In fact, when the "particular" people swear allegiance, caliphate is established, afterwards all must attend the general allegiance. Mālik Ashtar's speech against the disagreement of Qā'idīn denotes such a case. Imām rejected force too.[1] When the Khāridjites opposed, they were said to be silent, if they want to be safe. If they say something, they will be given reasons and in case they turn to swords, they will be resisted.

And he further said, "As long as you remember Allāh, we keep our mosques open to you and as long as you stay with us, we keep your share of booty but if you pull your swords out, we launch a war with you."[2]

Anyway, Qā'idīn regarded "congregation" incomplete to justify their opposition and naturally questioned 'Alī's caliphate. They said people of Damascus would complement this congregation whilst until then allegiance of people of Ḥaram wasn't considered sufficient. Mu'āwiya too having a large number of Damascus people in his control denied forming of "congregation" along with 'Alī and naturally rejected his caliphate.

In front of 'Alī's call, Mu'āwiya wrote to people of obedience and congregation, "The community you're talking about is also available to us." He accused 'Alī of murdering their caliph and dispersing their community.[3] There is no reasonable justification about the Infidels. The evidence show that these people opposed merely because of authoritarianism despite the commitments they had in allegiance. Imām tried hard to rehabilitate peace and in no case he resorted to weapon. Imām regarded their launching war the only permit to wage war.[4]

Aside from all incentives and internal problems, the events in period of caliphate resulted in different sectarian and religious tilts that left behind works not only in jurisprudic-ideological matters but also in the field of Imamate issues. Later, "political community" came to posed again and the Sunnites calling themselves independent of "people of innovation" and devaluing their participation in or separation from "congregation" named themselves "people of congregation."

---

permitted war with them(Imām meant people who refused to pay tax alms). How didn't you oppose him? See al-Mi'yār wa l-muwāzana,p.106

[1]. Tārikh al-ṭabarī, vol.V, pp.72-73

[2]. al-Mi'yār wa l-Muwāzina, p.106; Akhbār al-ṭiwāl, p.143

[3]. Mukhtaṣar Tārikh Dimashq, vol.XXV, p.35

[4]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.II, p.240; al-Mi'yār wa l-Muwāzina, p.158

Abū Ḥātim Rāzī writes about the term of congregation for the Sunnites, "Since the majority of people accepted caliphate of the Umayyads during Mu'āwiya and after in Marwānīds time, people from the followers asserting this called themselves people of congregation.... And saying that "if anyone opposes us, he breaks apart the unity, opposes Umma and abandons the tradition. By "people of Sunnat and Djamā'at", they meant that they named themselves so because they were unanimous by the same Imām despite all sectarian differences they had.[1] The pivotal role in "congregation" is in fact the same Imamate. According to a Sunnites mind, community appears when all people generally agree on an Imām who is in power in whatever way. Such an Imām is entirely legitimate according to a Sunnites. In Shī'a thinking, Imām is beyond a mere political consensus and community normally has its given sense.

Allegiance wasn't sworn to Imām on Friday, Dhi l-Ḥadjdja 18,36 H.

IMĀM'S PROBLEMS

When Imām took charge of caliphate, he faced tremendous problems. These obstacles in addition to political disorder after death of 'Uthmān darkly imaged the future. Here, problems are reviewed and the solutions ahead of Imām will be discussed. Before everything it is to known that these problems were important for a person like Imām who showed more sensitivity to observing principles and applications than anybody else. Some time earlier, every caliph had opened a way temporarily and just for the purpose of expanding the conquests. But now it wasn't obvious that many of those ways were off the roads and time passed had shown this. Typically, 'Umar considered tribal tenets in regulating chancery. Presently after fifteen years, its social and even political negative consequences have turned up. To arrange the issue more, Imām's problems are multi-dimensionally dealt with,

(1) The first problem wasn't to follow economic justice. Earlier referred that 'Umar set the chancery in accordance with the Islamic records of people and tribal shape. Those of the companions who had embraced Islam sooner than others shared more. The same condition kept on during 'Uthmān as well. He began his generosity leading to greater rich-poor distance in the community. All this property includes the fifth of booties and tributes that were annually received and came from the conquered territories belonging to all people. When Imām came to power, he raised equal sharing of this property. His reason rested upon what the Prophet(s) had done.

---

[1]. Kitāb al-zīna, p.225

Imām in his very speech referring to the point that he will act upon the Prophet's biography spoke of his fiscal policy and called virtue of Muhādjir and Anṣār superior over others, that is kept and rewarded by God. وإني حاملكم على منهج نبيكم صلى الله عليه وآله

But in this world, anyone who accepts call of God and His Messenger(s) and becomes a Muslim and pray before Qibla, he will benefit from all rights and Islamic rules. You're servants of God, Imām added, and property is God's that will equally be divided among you. The pious people are well rewarded by God.

Underlining his policy, Imām said, "Lest someone tomorrow say", حرمنا علي بن ابي طالب حقوقنا[1] Imām tomorrow that day ordered 'Ubayd Allāh Ibn Abī Rāfi', Anyone came, give him three Dīnārs.

In there Sahl Ibn Ḥunayf said, This man wasn't my slave who wasn't set free yesterday.

Imām said, "All are given three Dīnārs and no one is over another."

A group of Umayyads elites as well as Ṭalḥa and Zubayr did'nt turn up to get their share. Tomorrow that day, Walīd Ibn 'Uqba with a number of people came to Imām and referring to his father's murder by 'Alī in Uḥud, murder of Sa'd Ibn 'Āṣ in there, humiliation of Marwān's father in front of 'Uthmān and.... Asked Imām not to take back at least what has been given to them of the property. Besides, 'Uthmān's murderers are retaliated. Imām turned him down and so they started to reveal their discords.

Tomorrow again, Imām made a sermon and based his sharing of property on the Book out of wrath. Imām came down the pulpit and after rendering two units of pray sat with Ṭalḥa and Zubayr on the corner of mosque. These two people spoke of first, Imām's not consulting with them and second, خلافك عمر بن الخطاب في القسم

A major disadvantage is that you disagree on the way of division comparing 'Umar. You gave our share just like that of others who took no sufferings for Islam.

Imām said, ؛As long as there is a rule in Qur'ān, consultation is not required. Otherwise, I would've consulted with you. As for equal sharing, we all witnessed that the Messenger(s) did as the Book says."[2]

Zubayr said, "This is our reward? We acted in this way for him! To have 'Uthmān killed and he today puts people over us whom we were over."[1]

---

[1]. Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, vol.VII, pp.36-37

[2]. Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, vol.VII, pp.37-42; al-Mi'yār wa l-Muwāzina, p.111-114; Da'ā'im al-islām, vol.I, p.384; Nahdj al-sa'āda, vol.I, pp.200,415 and Ibid. from, Tuḥaf al-'Uqūl, p.125;Amālī, Ibn al-Shiykh, section 44, p.91, No.5, Rawḍa al-kāfī, No.551

Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd regards public habit a major problem for disagreement of companions with Imām while Abū Bakr had the same manner as the Prophet's and nobody opposed him.

Imām in response to companions who objected to his method and referred to 'Umar's manner said, أفسنّة رسول الله أولى بالاتباع أم سنة عمر[2] "Does obeying the Prophet's tradition stand first or that of 'Umar's."

Serious disapproval of this manner induced some companions of Imām to go to Imām to ask him to prefer Arab and Quraysh noblemen than Mawālī and non-Arabs.

He rejected them and said, "Are you telling me that I gain victory through cruelty."[3]

Later, Ibn 'Abbās writing to Imām Ḥasan said, "People left your father alone and went to Mu'āwiya because he equally shared the property among them and they never endured this act of your father."[4]Some people explicitly reasoned their opposition as that 'Alī failed to observe their equal rights.[5]

Anyway, one feature Imām became known after wasn't that, قسم بالسوية وعدل في الرعية[6]

(2) Elsewhere it wasn't referred that one of the consequences of conquests wasn't that different races of Arab, Iran, Nabat, Byzantine and Barbar were intermingled with one another. Many of them were gone or taken to other regions by migration or for war. A large number of them were prisoners from Arab tribes brought to Damascus, Iraq and Saudi Arabia from different parts. The captives released were called "Mawālī". This meant that the prisoner belonged to this Arab tribe and now he is linked to that tribe in one way or another. It wasn't natural that Mawālī were of lower class of Arabs and enjoyed less rights. One of the difficulties the government had wasn't how it should treat this case. What is certain is when Imām came to power, the community had assumed Arab superiority over Mawālī a definite principle. This disturbed Imām's justice-seeking morale that never found religiously a reason for veracity of the above-mentioned distinction but adversely equality of Muslims had clear reasons.

'Umar had said that the Arab slaves be released by means of public property,[1] thus differentiating diverse races, Imām rejected the distinction.

---

[1]. Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, vol.VII, pp.37-42

[2]. Da'ā'im al-islām, vol.I, p.384; Nahdj al-sa'āda, vol.I, p.229

[3]. al-Ghārāt, vol.I, p.75; Nathr al-durr, vol.I, p.318

[4]. Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, vol.16, p.23; al-Futūḥ, vol.IV, p.149

[5]. Bahdj al-ṣabāqa, vol.II, pp.197-203

[6]. al-Mi'yār wa l-Muwāzina, p.227; see,Ḥayāt al-ṣaḥaba, vol.II, p.113

Two women are said to have come to Imām 'Alī and expressed their destitution.

It is, Imām said, up to us to help you in case you tell the truth. Then he sent a man to market to buy them dress and food and pay them one hundred dhms.

One of them said in objection, "I'm an Arab while the other is Mawālī, why should we be treated equally?"

Imām replied, "I read Qur'ān and I thought, there I noticed no superiority, as small as a mosquito's wing, of Ismā'īl children over those of Isaac."[2]

Once Imām intending to divide some property said, "Rev.Adam gave birth to neither a male slave nor a female one, servants of God are all free.... now some property is with me and I'll divide it among the black and white people equally with no distinction."[3]

Treating Arabs and non-Arabs in parity was not something endurable for Arabs. Umm Hānī, Imām 'Alī's sister, came to Imām to get her grant and Imām granted her twenty dhms. Her non-Arab slave also came to Imām and he gave her twenty dhms. When Umm Hānī heard this, she went to see Imām in fury. Imām's response to her accorded with Qur'ān that he has not seen any differentiation between Arabs and non-Arabs there.[4]

Imām elsewhere told Muhādjirūn and Anṣār that he never gives anybody anything aimlessly and, لأسوين بين الأسود والأحمر "The black and the white will be treated in parity."[5]

Imām's just treatment towards Mawālī and non-Arabs raised protest of prejudiced people like Ash'ath Ibn Qays.

When Imām wasn't up on pulpit, Ash'ath shouted, غلبتنا عليك الحمراء "The white Mawālī has overcome us and you see that." 'Alī became angry hearing that.

Ibn Ṣūḥān said, "It'll become clear today what status Arabs are placed in."

'Alī said, "Who excuses me to penalize these sturdy-body people resting in their beds till mid-noon while a group of people stay away their beds because of vigil nights? Are you telling me that I should abandon them and

---

[1]. Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā, vol.III, p.342

[2]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.II, p.141; al-Ghārāt. (And in footnote from Wasā'il al-shī'a, Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, Biḥār al-anwār). Tārikh al-ya'qūbī, vol II, p.183

[3]. Nahdj al-sa'āda, vol I, p.189

[4]. Ibid, vol 1, p. 212

[5]. Ibid, vol1, p. 212 – 213; from: al-Ikhtiṣāṣ, p.151; Biḥār, vol 41, p. 106; Mustadrak al-wasā'il, vol 11, p.93

become an oppressor. I swear to One that grew the seed and created the creatures and I heard Muḥammad (s) saying,

I swear to God they beat you (Arabs) to return to religion just as you did to them to accept Islam.[1] Mughīra Ḍabbī says, 'Alī (a) was interested in Mawālī and was kind to them but 'Umar loathed them and kept away from them."[2]

Included in Imām's poetry, there is a piece of poem that talks about negating the effect of racial problems on divine and human honor,

لعمرك ما الإنســـان إلاّ بـــدينه فلا تترك التقوى اتكالاً علي الحسب

فقد رفع الإسلام سلمان فارس وقد هجن الشرك الشـــريف أبا لهب

"Religion, swear by thy soul, brings value to man

Thou not for a lineage seek divine piety Whilst Abū Lahab was down for no deity."[3]

(3) More important problem ahead of Imām was religious deviations and the very thing companions accused 'Uthmān of that under title of innovationism. Apart from the innovations, the other major problem was that many people were not well-informed about religion and no action was taken to religiously inform them. A few objective typical distortions Imām was engaged are mentioned herein,

One of the problems earlier talked about is that a group of companions and a number of caliphs brought up rules despite availability of Qur'ān and tradition and merely based on "expediency". Inter alia, this regarding tradition is more clearly and substantially is cited in historical and hadith sources. Perhaps what Abū Dja'far Naqīb said could be the clearest statement one moderate Sunnites has expressed about.

The companions, he says, unanimously rejected most of the verses (the words of the Messenger Īs») and it was because of the interest they discovered in rejecting them such as sharing portion of Ḍawī al-Qurbā and that of Mu'allafa Qulūbuhum.[4]

Imām criticized this approach while making a detailed speech and at the same time showed his commitment to the tradition. Referring to the fact that for resolving one problem there has been given different views and the ruler has proved all those views, he says this is when their God is One, their prophet is one and their Book is one. God said to them to go a different

---

[1] al-Ghārāt, p. 186 – 187; Gharīb al-ḥadīth, Abū 'Ubayd, vol 3, p. 484; Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, vol 19, p. 184

[2]. al-Ghārāt. p.187 (Persian translation)

[3] Mukhtaṣar Tārīkh Dimashq, vol.10, p.46

[4] Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha. Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, vol.12, pp.82-90

direction and they have obeyed His command? Or they have been prohibited from disagreement and they have disobeyed Him? Or what God sent is an incomplete religion and He asked them to help for making it complete? Or they are His partners and they have right to say and God must be pleased of the path they seek? Or the religion God sent was complete and the Prophet (s) has failed in conveying it?

This is while God say, "We avoided not a thing in the Book".[1]

Imām expresses amazement in his another speech about the wrongs of different groups and that, "They neither receive a prophet nor the deed of a successor... they follow sceptisism and go after passion and lust. Well-known to them is something that they know and are pleased of and deny what they are not happy with. In tribulations they only rely on themselves and in undoing the problems they depend on their own ideas. It seems each of them is his Imām who finds, in his rule, to have snatched and used the sturdiest means."[2]

What was interesting was that "according to caliph II and III" they had the right to have their own special divine legislation in some affairs and put aside the tradition (like 'Uthmān who, unlike the prophet and his own pre-caliphs, performed completely his praying service in Minā). Yet, Muslims as a matter of time deemed the actions of caliphs unbreachable as a religious tradition.

'Umar himself when dying said, "Assigning not a successor is a tradition (Prophet!) and assigning is also a tradition (Abū Bakr)."[3]

Therefore, to him, what Abū Bakr did had also been considered "tradition". After his death, 'Abd al-Raḥmān had conditioned that he would leave the caliphate to someone who practices the tradition of the Prophet and Shiykhs.

One clear typical response of Imām to these innovations was his approach towards nightly prayers of Ramaḍān that 'Umar set up accepting it to be an innovation-though he believed it was a good innovation. When Imām was in Kūfa, some people came to ask him to designate an Imām to perform their nightly prayers of Ramaḍān. He banned them doing so. At night they cried out, "O Ramaḍān".

Ḥārith A'war came to Imām and said, "People are moaning and are upset about what you said."

Imām said, "Leave them alone to do whatever they want and whomever to choose for congregational Imām."[1]

---

[1] Nahdj al-balāgha, sermon 18

[2]. Nahdj al-balāgha, sermon 88

[3]. Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā, vol.III, p.342

This quotation shows that what tribe Imām has been dealing with and how they have been following him.

Imām in a letter to Mālik, referring to selection of righteous people and about the worldly-minded religious people said, فإنّ هذا الدين كان أسيراً في أيدي الأشرار ، يعمل فيه بالهوى وتطلب به الدنيا. "This religion has been in the shackles of the wrong people, they moved forward out of passion and captured the world under the name of religion."[2]

One of the important deviations that essentially led to other ones was that scribing was prevented. Rashīd Riḍā referred to point that this has irreparably damaged the Islamic culture.[3] Such an action as mentioned earlier was because of disregarding the tradition.

The action of caliphs to collect Qur'ān and disregard the Qur'ān 'Alī brought as well as to comment and downgrade its verses indicated inattention to the Prophet's speech Imām recorded.

Imām 'Alī regarded doubt and scepticism among people a major cause for emerging civil wars among Muslims, ولكنّا إنما أصبحنا نقاتل إخواننا في الاسلام على ما دخل فيه من الزيغ والإعوجاج والشبهة والتأويل "We today fight our Muslim brethren because they mixed Islam with deviation, scepticism and distraction."[4]

Imām underscored the concept of scepticism. He elsewhere said, "Scepticism is called scepticism for it resembles the right."[5]

(4) Another problem Imām had wasn't social corruption. Serious public welfare triggered loosening of religious ideals and values in society and religion wasn't just valued in appearance. When caliph III turned to serious welfare, His subjects also turned to it and this created a problem for society in respect of religion. The society involved in sedition and corruption cannot simply turn back to moral balance. Imām in one of his speeches introduces his society like that of ignorant one.

He says, "Your condition today looks like the day God raised up His Messenger(s)."[6]

Imām there spoke of reversed values in that society and of the necessity to change it. This society has to be screened, those moved forward be brought back and those left behind be driven ahead.

---

[1]. Mustaṭrafāt al-sarā'ir, p.146, and in its footnote, Biḥār, vol.96, p.38; Wasā'il al-shī'a, vol.5, p.193; Tafsīr 'Ayyāshī, vol.I, p.175

[2] Nahdj al-balāgha, letter 53

[3] al-Manār, vol.6, p.288

[4] Nahdj al-balāgha, sermon 123

[5] Ibid. sermon 38

[6] Ibid. sermon 16

Know that, he also said, after Hidjra –and learning from Sharī'a- you were back to nomadic nature and following compromise you were fragmented..... knowing that you cast off your link to Islam, went beyond its limits and failed to follow its rules.[1]

Imām also stated about corruption of the time, واعلموا رحمكم الله أنكم في زمان القائل فيه بالحق قليل واللسان عن الصدق كليل واللازم للحق ذليل. أهله معتكفون على العصيان، مصطلحون على الادهان، فتاهم عارم وشائبهم آثم وعالمهم منافق وقارئهم مماذق لا يعظم صغيرهم كبيرهم ولايعول غنيهم فقيرهم "Know that may God bless you! You are living at a time the truth- seeker is little and tongue falls short of truth. Those following truth are humiliated and people are grappling with disobedience and ready to accept compromise. The young are bad-tempered and the old are sinful, the reciter is after profit. Neither the small respects the aged nor do the potent aid the destitute.[2]

Emergence of Mu'āwiya as a deceitful and deviated man in the field of Islamic politics wasn't itself the greatest element of sedition and corruption in society, so were the 'Uthmānids tendency in Baṣra as well as the Khāridjites in Kūfa. These were ill currents that blocked the way of followers of truth at times by knowing that they were wrong and at other times imagining that they are going after truth.

Observing Mu'āwiya's sedition, Imām began to say, "I verified the case and I learned that I have no way but fighting or I stand infidel against what Muḥammad (s) said."[3]

REFORMATION, IMĀM'S FUNDAMENTAL POLICY

Imām considered his major mission a reformation. This was because he abided by religion and tradition. In addition, it is to be noted that Imām was basically brought to power by those who had murdered the former caliph due to his corruption and hoped that the new caliph reform the shortcomings. The aim of this group in proportionate to character of Imām was one of the main reasons of their approach towards him. The policy of early caliphs was to expand the conquests. This also expanded Islam and naturally could be an advantage for caliphs, not to mention, it would fill the pockets of people with dhms and Dīnārs.

Imām now had to make up for the shortcomings of this time. It was very difficult for him to do so because he had to stand against many of the noblemen and influential people. Here, Imām's reformational actions are

---

[1] Nahdj al-balāgha. sermon 192

[2] Ibid. sermon 233; Rabi' al-abrār, vol.1, p.96

[3] Nahdj al-balāgha, sermon 54

reviewed. First, it is to be noted that these actions contained two parts. One part was to be done by means of speech and peaceful social actions, but the second part was to be carried out through war with those who were not ready to observe the rights of the legitimate ruler of society and had rebelled against him. Some of the actions taken in the first part are dealt with here.

One of the moral problems in the society Imām was engaged in was mammonism, welfarism and acquisitiveness of triumphant Arabs. This case had engaged them so much that it can be said Djamal war was resulted and Imām was not prepared to raise shares of Ṭalḥa and Zubayr more than the others. Under such circumstances, Imām was determined to speak in detail in his speeches about this and protract people from mammonism. By contrast, he prohibited them from sitting at the majestic entertainment tables by writing letters to his agents, something that was very natural in time of 'Uthmān. In case Imām's words about reproaching the world outright, it would become a detailed book.[1]

Nahdj al-Balāgha is replete with these words and this, in great number, shows that Imām insisted very much in this regard. Presenting an outstanding paradigm of man with a piety is seen in the sermon known as

"Hammām". In some of the sermons, Imām explicitly scolds people due to mammonism, "You have forgotten the death in your hearts and deceiving aspirations have been substituted. This world has captured you more than the other world."[2]

Imām placed elucidation of religion atop of his reformational actions and tried to lead the society to improvement by raising up the Prophet's tradition as well as resuscitating the forgotten rules and positive laws of religion. Imām on explaining his activities for reforming the society says, ألم أعمل فيكم بالثقل الأكبر وأترك فيكم الثقل الاصغر وركزت فيكم راية الايمان ووقفتكم على حدود الحلال والحرام والبستكم العافية من عدلي وفرشتكم المعروف من قولي وفعلي وأريتكم كرائم الأخلاق من نفسي. "Did I not raise rule of Qur'ān among you and my two offsprings – who are the lamp of religion path after me – and did I not leave for you the selective jewels that is the Prophet's progeny. I set up banner of faith among you and separated you from limits of legal and illegal. I clad you in garment of health out of justice and spread the known among you through my word and deed and revealed to you the best ethics through my ethicality."[3]

Imām in his speech emphatically referred to practicing the Book and the Prophet's tradition. The Imām's faithfulness to the Messenger's tradition is

---

[1] Zamakhsharī has mentioned some parts in Rabi' al-abrār, vol.1 from page 41 on.

[2] Nahdj al-balāgha, sermon 113

[3] Nahdj al-balāgha, sermon 87

an important point in his reformational policies. Basically, violating the tradition according to him, is one of the blatant signs of deviation.

In the early times when Ṭalḥa and Zubayr complained of Imām's not consulting with them, Imām said, "By God I had no inclination to caliphate and no need of rulership, but you made me be in charge of that. As I came to power, I looked at the Book and what it has prescribed to us and the rules we are bound to obey and I did so. I followed the tradition set by the Messenger (s). I required not to ask you of your idea about this but you."[1]

Imām in his contact with 'Uthmān about being clothed in a pilgrim state during Ḥadjdj or about doing the same in the visitation and Ḥadjdj together says on the tradition of the Messenger (s), ما كنت لأدع سنّة رسول الله صلى الله عليه وآله وسلم لأحد من الناس "I never leave tradition of the Messenger (s) because of anybody."[2]

'Uthmān was sick one year of the years he used to perform his prayers in Minā so he asked Imām to perform prayers instead.

Imām said, "If I perform prayers, I'll do it as the Prophet did."

'Uthmān said, "No. Do as I do."

Imām rejected his request.[3]

Imām said, "If I'm absent, then who will be among you to act upon the Prophet's conduct?"[4]

I was doing prayer service, Muṭrif Ibn 'Abd Allāh says, along with 'Imrān Ibn Ḥuṣayn (one of the Prophet's companions) behind Imām 'Alī. After the service 'Imrān held my hand and said, لقد صلى صلاة محمد، ولقد ذكّرني صلاة محمد (ص) "He performed the service like that of the Prophet's. He reminded me of how the Prophet said the prayers."[5]

Abū Mūsā Ash'arī who performed the service just behind Imām said, ذكرنا علي بن ابي طالب صلاة النبي (ص) "'Alī reminded us of the Prophet's prayers."[6]

It was very important to revive the Prophet(s)'s biography for Imām's reformational policies. The pure companions of Imām realized this fact as well.

'Ammār said about the constructie measures of Imām, لو أن علياً لم يعمل عملاً ولم يصنع شيئاً الا أنه أحيا التكبيرتين عند السجود لكان قد أصاب بذلك فضلاً عظيماً "'Alī has done

---

[1] Nahdj al-balāgha. sermon 205

[2] Tārikh al-madīnat al-Munawwara, vol.3, pp.1043-1044

[3] al-Amālī fī Āthār ṣaḥāba, p.50

[4] al-Muṣannaf, 'Abd al-Razzāq, vol.10, p.124

[5] Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.2, p.180

[6] Tārikh al-Kabīr, Bukhārī, vol.4, p.33; al-Ghadīr, vol.9, p.66, vol.10, p.201

nothing but reviving two "Allāh Akbar" when prostrating back, for this, he has achieved a high virtue."[1]

Imām declared up on pulpit in the face of 'Umar's policy of not scribing hadith, "Those who are willing to put down knowledge, they can bring paper and pen".

Ḥārith A'war provided means of writing and wrote what Imām said.[2] Afterwards, Imām Ḥasan(a) also advised his offsprings to write the Prophet(s)'s hadith.[3] We know that Imām 'Alī himself wrote the Messenger's hadiths. After that, his hadith booklets were available to Ahl al-Bayt and they regularly narrated hadith for Shi'ite Muslims from "'Alī's booklet".[4]

As seen in time of caliph II, the story reciters alongside preventing from scription of hadith were permitted to narrate for people in the mosque about the Jewish sagas on former prophets and Christian priests. Imām stood against the development of story reciting and banned it while spreading hadith scription. Imām in principle opposed narration of Jewish works.

He is quoted to say, "Whoever has a book from the antecedent, he shall ruin it".[5]

Imām stood against someone who had narrated story of Rev. David (a) with Awriya from Jewish sources and said, "If someone says it, he'll be executed Ḥadd, whipping".[6]

It is known that Rev. David is attributed to murder by intention and adultery in this fake story. When he came to Baṣra, the story reciters were expelled out of mosque.[7] After him, Imām Ḥasan (a) was also hindered from

---

[1] Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.II, p.179; al-Muṣannaf, Ibn Abī Shayba, vol.I, p.204(printed in India)

[2] Taqyīd al-'ilm, p.90; Rabi' al-abrār, vol.III, PP.226,294; Tārikh Baghdād, vol.8, p.357; al-Tarātīb al-Idariyya, vol.II,p. 259; Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā, vol.6, p.116

[3] Tardjamat al-imām al-Ḥasan(a), Ibn Sa'd, p.156

[4] concerning " Kitāb 'Alī bi Imlā'al-Nabī(s)",Aḥmadī Mīyānidjī, the master, completed a detailed research about "Makātīb al-rasūl" and extracted some cases narrated by the Infallible Imāms from 'Alī's booklet.

[5] concerning " Kitāb 'Alī bi Imlā'al-Nabī(s)",Aḥmadī Mīyānidjī, the master, completed a detailed research about "Makātīb al-rasūl" and extracted some cases narrated by the Infallible Imāms from 'Alī's booklet.

[6] Madjma' al-bayān, vol.8, p.472

[7] Qūt al-qulūb, vol.II, p.302; Wasā'il al-shī'a, vol.II, P.515; al-Tahdhīb, vol.II, p.486; al-Kāfī, vol.II, p.312; Nathr al-durr, vol.I, p.312; Akhbār Iṣbahān, vol.I,p. 89

story reciting.[1] Imām Sadjdjād (a) stopped Ḥasan Baṣrī,once being a story reciter, reciting stories and he admitted to do so.[2]

Imām in one of his first speeches said, وإني حاملكم على منهج نبيكم صلي الله عليه وآله "I will spread tradition of the Prophet(s) among you."[3]

One of the reasons that caused Imām 'Alī, more than the other companions, to describe the personality and morality of the Messenger(s) in historical books, is that he himself followed the Prophet's manner. For the same reason, he kept in his mind all actions of the Prophet(s) from the very beginning and later he tried to delineate his personality most eloquently.[4]

Ḥasan Baṣrī in response to someone who asked him of Imām said, أراهم السبيل وأقام لهم الدين اذا اعوجّ "He showed the way to people and straightened religion when it went astray."[5]

This very well-considered statement made by Ḥasan exactly accorded with the policy Imām adopted during his caliphate.

Another poet, addressing Imām, composed this,

أوضحت من ديننا ما كان مشتبها جزاك ربك عنا فيه إحسانا

"What was skeptical is now clarified by you, may God grant thee virtues and benevolence."[6]

Abūdhar when describing Imām said, علي رز الدين "'Alī strengthens religion."[7]

Imām himself insisted on matching his conduct with that of the Messenger(s)'s. After Djamal war, he talked about his attitude towards Baṣrans, "I acted in treating Baṣrans as the Prophet did to Meccans.[8] Imām mentions resuscitation of tradition as one of the functions of "Imām".[9] Elsewhere, he regards the best servant of God a just Imām who attempts to

---

[1] Tārīkh al-ya'qūbī, vol.II, pp.227-228

[2] Wafayāt al-a'yān, vol.I, p.70. Concerning positions of other Imāms, "Qiṣṣih khānān dar tārikh Islām wa Īrān",pp.93 - 102, Qum, 1999

[3] Sharḥ Nahdj al-balāgha, vol.7, p.36

[4] See one detailed example of that in, Nahdj al-sa'āda, vol.I, pp.74-79 and the sources in there. We mentioned other sources in the first volume of the book under the topic of " the historical role of the Messenger(s)".

[5] al-Muṣannaf, Ibn Abī Shayba, vol.12, p.36

[6] Naqd,p.496; Tuḥaf al-'Uqūl, pp.338-342; Musnad al-imām al-Hādī, p.207; Biḥār al-anwār, vol.38, p.245

[7] al-Fā'iq fī Gharīb al-ḥadīth, vol.II, p.108

[8] Ansāb al-ashrāf, ol.II, p.273

[9] Nahdj al-balāgha, sermon 105

revive the tradition and the most evil-doing servant of God a cruel Imām who destroys it."[1]

In general, Imām 'Alī seriously avoids the concept of innovation and says, in this regard, that a tradition fades away when an innovation emerges.[2]

Imām poses two points as his testament, stop blasphemizing and preserving tradition of the Prophet(s).[3]

He considers the saints those people who, يحيون سنن الله وسنن رسوله "Revive traditions of God and His Messenger(s)."[4]

He says hypocrite dissidents are those who swim in the sea of sedition, use innovations and put aside traditions.[5]

Imām says people are divided in two groups,[6] متبع شرعة ومبتدع بدعة

These statements and the like in Nahdj al-Balāgha reveal Imām's strong mind in following tradition and avoiding the innovation. This position was adopted in front of those who created innovations at least in some cases and when they were objected, they said, "If they are innovations, they are good ones".

Imām was not willing to cheat in the field of religion and he said, والله لا أدهنت في ديني "I swear by God I never cheated in the field of religion."[7]

Once a man of Banū Asad was brought to Imām for execution of whipping (retribution). Banū Asad asked Imām to dispense with his whipping.

Imām said, "Ask me to do something at my discretion."

They came out while being contented.

Imām executed whipping for the man and said, "This was owned by God and I had no control over it."[8]

Imām said about his role of guiding Umma, "O people! I gave you advice the prophets did to their Umma and I let out what the legatees spread out after themselves. I behaved you with the lash of "preaching", but you rejected and I called you with the speech to bar you from disobeying, yet

---

[1] Nahdj al-balāgha, sermon 164

[2] Ibid. sermon 145

[3] Ibid. sermon 149

[4] Ibid. sermon 192

[5] Ibid. sermon 154

[6] Ibid. sermon 176

[7] Nahdj al-sa'āda, vol.II, p.537

[8] Rabi' al-abrār, vol.I, p.530

you failed to do so. By God! Do you expect an Imām but me to join you in the straight path?"[1]

Also, he said of himself, "Verily I look like a lamp in the dark among you; one who steps in the dark, he shall use light of that lamp."[2]

Anyway, Imām insisted on exact compliance with the Prophet(s)'s tradition such that he even tried to act like the Prophet(s) in his actions.

When Imām objected why he serves people in the mosque with good food but he himself eats wheat germ with bread at home, he weepingly replied, "I swear by God I had never seen bread without wheat germ in the Prophet(s)'s home.[3] What Imām said meant that he attempted to have his food like that of the Prophet(s)'s.

IMĀM IN THE FACE OF INFIDELS (DJAMAL WAR)

Only several months after Imām came to power in 36H., the first civil war happened in Djamādī al-Thānī of that year among Muslims instigated by a group of promise-breachers led by Ṭalḥa, Zubayr and 'Āyisha. To further clarify the historical background of this bitter event, it is to review the political lines of then Medina.

It was mentioned in the post-demise of the Messenger(s) that there had been two tendencies of the Umayyads and the Hāshimites none of which could attain caliphate after Imām, The Umayyads due to being long-standingly anti-Islam and the Hāshimites because of Quraysh's envy and problems they had with Imām 'Alī.

The middle faction of Quraysh, that is Abū Bakr and 'Umar, came to power leading to this group being set aside. No matter what happened during these two men, a suitable ground was prepared for 'Uthmān, one of the Umayyads, among all Quraysh. As said in the section relating to selection of 'Uthmān, he was so popular among Quraysh people. When 'Uthmān dealt with just the Umayyads around Quraysh, the middle line once again was capricious of caliphate. Among them, Ṭalḥa, a fellow-tribe of Abū Bakr of Banū Taym, wanted to attain caliphate with the support of 'Āyisha. Zubayr also helped him for a while and he himself was eager to grab caliphate.

When Djamal war was waged, Ibn 'Abbās said to Zubayr, "'Āyisha wants the government for Ṭalḥa, what are you doing here?"[4]

---

[1] Nahdj al-balāgha, sermon 182

[2] Ibid. sermon 187

[3] Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.II, p.187

[4] Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.II, p.252(footnote)of, Tārikh Dimashq, vol. 28, p.67; Tahdhīb Tārikh Dimashq, vol.5, p.364

This middle line failed to find an opportunity in Medina and observed that 'Alī of the Hāshimites, after abdication of the Umayyads, assumed power. Now what had to be done? It first approved of the new government assuming that it can play a major role in the new government. Ṭalḥa and Zubayr suggested to rule over Baṣra, Kūfa or Damascus. Imām smartly said that they were more needed in Medina.[1] This aim was not fulfilled and Ṭalḥa and Zubayr, leaders of the middle line, departed to Mecca to do the lesser pilgrimage and there they could talk to 'Āyisha, gone to Mecca before the death of 'Uthmān and was still there.

Up to now there are three political lines. The Hāshimites, the Umayyads, and the middle line of Quraysh that long time after appeared as "Abnā' al-Muhādjirūn" in rebelling against 'Abd Allāh Ibn Zubayr. Djamal movement crystallized showdown of Quraysh's middle line knowing itself follower of Abū Bakr and 'Umar. Ṭalḥa and Zubayr could satisfy 'Āyisha to join them and this was the greatest breakthrough for them. 'Āyisha both had familial relationship with Ṭalḥa and showed mercy on her nephew. In this trip, 'Abd Allāh played a major role in accompanying 'Āyisha. They could absorb three thousand people and move up to Baṣra.

The infidels made excuse for three reasons. First, 'Uthmān was oppressedly murdered. This was posed while Ṭalḥa, Zubayr and 'Āyisha were among those who mostly contributed to rebellion resulting in 'Uthmān's murder. They recklessly said that they had repented and now they were ready to make up for what they have done by seeking revenge for oppressed caliph! Certainly, this was raised for stupefied Muslims who were unaware of the real story. Another point was that they were forced to swear allegiance in Medina; therefore, the allegiance is improper and Imām's government is illegitimate at least to them as they are not committed to obey caliph because of the forcible allegiance according to what they said. The solution they brought up was that everything should be resolved in a way raised in the end of 'Umar's lifetime, that is "Shuwrā".

When 'Āyisha asked Ṭalḥa and Zubayr of her duty, she was told, "Go and tell the people that 'Uthmān was oppressedly killed and the affairs have to go back to council of Muslims meaning the situation created by 'Umar."[2]

The council in which Ṭalḥa and Zubayr took part raised a hope for their caliphate. This council caused Ṭalḥa, Zubayr and Waqqāṣ to imagine that

---

[1] Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.4, p.429; Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.II, p.218

[2] Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.II, p.223.Major source on Djamal war is the book of "al-Djamal" by Shiykh Mufīd who has prepared it out of tens of sources accessible to him in that time. We have used this book as well as others previously written.

they are fully illegible for caliphate. Zubayr in the midst of Djamal war told Imām 'Alī that he was not more illegible for caliphate than them.[1]

The Umayyads residing in Ḥidjāz rushed to help this group opportunistically. Marwān Ibn Ḥakam, 'Abd Allāh Ibn 'Āmir,'Abd al-Raḥmān Ibn 'Attāb Ibn Abi l-'Āṣ and Sa'īd Ibn 'Āṣ were among those who instigated people. A little while after, Sa'īd Ibn 'Āṣ and Mughīra Ibn Shu'ba, initially one of the defenders, abdicated.[2]

The Umayyads's assistance, at this time, was just because of opportunism and for believing in what Ṭalḥa and Zubayr said. We know that Marwān at the end of Djamal war spear-killed Ṭalḥa in revenge for 'Uthmān.

More contemplation has to be made about 'Āyisha, wife of the Prophet(s). 'Āyisha had a high status during her father's rule and 'Umar's, her father's friend. 'Umar gave her share more than the other wives of the Messenger(s) and this wasn't because she played a leading role in changes of his caliphate.[3] 'Āyisha is said to have owed a lot to 'Umar.[4]

'Āyisha said, "During mourning service of 'Umar, she heard jinns[5] elegizing for him. Even in her sleep, she dreamed as if 'Umar were endowed with prophethood."[6]

By taking advantage of her talent in narrating hadith and credited with being the Prophet(s)'s wife, she maintained this to the end, although she and Mu'āwiya could not get along well. 'Āyisha, during these years, tried to recognize herself as the dearest wife of the Messenger(s) leaving behind an acceptable image of herself and her father. She said she was six or seven when engaged and nine when married.[7] Despite the news that the Prophet(s) at times excused her from Abū Bakr,[8] she said, "Her marriage to the Prophet(s) ordained from God.[9] This is while we know that Zaynab,

---

[1] Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.II, p.255

[2] Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.II, pp.222-223; Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā, vol.5, p.34

[3] As earlier said, when Abū Bakr said prayers, just one, instead of the Prophet(s), according to Imām 'Alī, 'Āyisha was the one who, from inside of home, introduced Abū Bakr.

[4] Ḥayāt al-ṣaḥāba, vol.II, P.300

[5] Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā, vol.III, P.274

[6] Tārīkh al-madīnat al-Munawwara, vol.III, P.942

[7] Concerning different statements and what she herself said in contradiction to this idea, Ḥadīth al-Ifk, from p.158 on

[8] Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā, vol.8, p.81

[9] Ibid., vol.8, p.68

daughter of Djaḥsh, was the only wife of the Prophet(s) who was so proud of that.[1]

In the later times of 'Uthmān's caliphate, 'Āyisha challenged him hard. Having been influenced by anti-'Uthmān opposition as well as her own criticisms, she stood against him. Unlike other wives of the Prophet(s), 'Āyisha primarily became involved in politics and naturally had a political personality. She could not remain silent in front of a wave of anti-'Uthmān rebellion. The considerable point is that what compelled her to engage in such a venturous political action in spite of a lot of problems she faced? To us, as far as her disagreement with Imām was concerned, the only incentive she had to take part in this was the vengeance she exerted against the Hāshimites, Fāṭima and 'Alī within the years of the Prophet(s)'s lifetime. Shiykh Mufīd has mentioned a few examples of 'Āyisha's grudge.[2] Otherwise, we know that she wasn't the most conscious people to be concerned with 'Alī's exoneration from 'Uthmān's murder.[3]

In addition, she wasn't interested in reversion of caliphate to Banū Taym. When anti-'Uthmān opposition peaked, 'Āyisha had gone to Mecca for the Ḥadjdj. There, she heard that 'Uthmān wasn't murdered and Ṭalḥa succeeded him. She became happy and went up to Medina to reach Saraf. She wasn't told there people have sworn allegiance to 'Alī.

Hearing this news, she returned to Mecca and cried out, "O the oppressed 'Uthmān."[4]

When 'Āyisha heard that people swore allegiance to 'Alī, she said, "One night of 'Uthmān equals the entire lifetime of 'Alī."[5]

After Imām wasn't martyred, 'Āyisha named the child brought to her "'Abd al-Raḥmān!"[6]

After Djamal war came to a defeat, 'Āyisha said to Ibn 'Abbās, "No town I'm more angry at than the one where you, the Hāshimites, live in."[7]

'Āyisha also said when informing about the Prophet(s)'s arrival in ending days of his life, "Two people helped him by his arms. One of them

---

[1] Ibid., vol.8, p.103

[2] al-Djamal, pp.157-160

[3] See the section on "'Uthmān's Opponents"

[4] Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.II, pp.217-218; vol.5, p.91; Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha of Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, vol.6, p.215

[5] Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.5, p.91

[6] al-Djamal,p.160 and in the footnote from,Al-Shāfī,vol.4, p.356; Biḥār al-anwār, vol.32, p.341

[7] al-Futūḥ, vol.II, P.337; Nathr al-durr, vol.4, p.21

wasn't Qutham Ibn 'Abbās and there wasn't another man!" According to narrator, by another man she meant 'Alī.[1] Of course, she sometimes confessed that the dearest man to the Prophet(s) was 'Alī and the dearest woman was Fāṭima. When she was questioned why she did so, she said with a brown face, "It was something done!"[2]

'Alī himself mentions the reasons why she exerted vengeance against him. ***First***, the Messenger(s) had preferred him than her father in different cases. ***Second***, there wasn't brotherhood between Imām and the Prophet(s) and so 'Umar wasn't selected for Abū Bakr. ***Third***, keeping doors of companions' houses closed into the mosque and leaving Imām's house door open to it. ***Fourth***, when Abū Bakr failed to do anything the day before, banner of triumph wasn't handed to Imām in Khaybar war. ***Fifth***, there wasn't the story of declaring the exoneration for which the Prophet(s) firstly dispatched Abū Bakr, but he wasn't brought back as ordered by God and Imām took charge of it. ***Sixth***, it wasn't 'Āyisha's grudge against Khadīdja whose daughter, Fāṭima, also had experienced that. ***Seventh***, there wasn't popularity of Imām towards the Prophet(s) in such a way that once 'Alī came up to the Prophet and he wasn't given a seat next to him. The Prophet(s) praised him in response to 'Āyisha's objection. This greatly raised her vengeance against Imām.[3] Shiykh Mufīd in his ending part of his book "al-Djamal" details another chapter on why 'Āyisha rendered grudge against Imām.[4]

Later on, when Imām Ḥasan (a) was to be buried near the Prophet(s), she opposed and said, "Why do you want to bury in my house someone whom I dislike?"[5]

Aḥmad Amīn explains about the reasons why 'Āyisha exerted vengeance against Fāṭima(a).[6]

Ṭalḥa and Zubayr came to Mecca and well learned that they cannot do anything without 'Āyisha.[7]

They said to her, "If Baṣrans meet you, they will be united with you."[8]

Imām said about 'Āyisha, "She is most obeyed among people."[1]

---

[1] Musnad Aḥmad, vol.6, pp.34, 38

[2] Rabī' al-abrār, vol.I, p.821

[3] al-Djamal, pp.409-412

[4] Ibid., pp.425-434

[5] Ibid., p.438

[6] Ẓahr al-islām, vol.4, pp.38-39

[7] Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.4, p.451

[8] Akhbār al-ṭiwāl, p.144

Through various talks, ‘Āyisha was convinced to join them to Baṣra. It was not so easy to go because she had to, in the first place, respond to her blatant disagreement on this Qur’ānic verse that obligates the Prophet(s)’s wives to stay in their homes, وقرن في بيوتكن.

This verse clearly bans the Prophet(s)’s wives from leaving their homes meaning their participation in political struggles. As said that ‘Umar even was doubtful about their going on the Ḥadjdj and he only once permitted them to do this by setting a lot of restrictions. Some wives such as Sūda and Zaynab were not willing to go on pilgrimage for the same reason.[2] Umm Salama tried hard to stop ‘Āyisha going. Interesting to know is that ‘Āyisha had asked her to join them to Baṣra. She said to Umm Salama quoting from ‘Abd Allāh Ibn ‘Āmir, “One hundred thousand swords are ready in Baṣra. Have you come to fix this?

In revenge for ‘Uthmān!, Said Umm Salama, were you not the hardest against him? Were you not the one who called him “Na‘thal”, the old stupid man?

Umm Salama described a few virtues of Imām ‘Alī and asked him not to oppose someone to whom Muhādjir and Anṣār have sworn allegiance.

She referred to this speech of the Prophet(s), عليّ ولي كل مؤمن ومؤمنة.

‘Abd Allāh Ibn Zubayr standing at the door said, “We haven’t heard the Prophet say such a thing”.

But your aunt, said Umm Salama, has heard that and this speech of the Prophet who said, علي خليفتي عليكم في حياتي ومماتي. ‘Āyisha confirmed that she has heard such a thing[3].

‘Āyisha spoke of her action taken for the improvement of Muslims’ affairs! She attempted to absorb Ḥafṣa.

He has the same idea, Ḥafṣa said, as ‘Āyisha’s. In this way, he decided to go to Basra but ‘Abd Allāh Ibn ‘Umar stopped him helping Djamal companions.[4]

Umm Salama, one of Ahl al-Bayt enthusiasts, wrote to Imām telling about the action of rebels, “By God if the Prophet(s)’s wives had not been banned leaving their homes, I would have come with you. Now I let the most beloved of my loved ones, that is my son, ‘Umar Ibn Abī Salama, come with you.”[5]

---

[1] Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.II, p.238

[2] al-Mu‘djam al-Kabīr, vol.24, p.34

[3] al-Futūḥ, vol.II, PP.282-283

[4] Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.4, p.451; al-Futūḥ, vol.II, p.284

[5] al-Futūḥ, vol.II, P.284

Umm Salama began to publicize Imām 'Alī among Meccans and said to them, "I call you to seek after divine piety and in this time I know no one better than 'Alī."[1]

When Maymūna, another wife the Prophet(s), heard about Ṭalḥa and Zubayr's rebellion, she told the bearer of the news, "Join 'Alī because he has never gone astray and nobody has been let astray by him". She repeated this three times[2].

Umm Faḍl, daughter of Hārith, in a letter by a courier to Imām, told him about the readiness of rebels.[3]

Medina was already in control of the Hāshimites and the rebels could not return. Damascus was also under the yoke of Mu'āwiya and it was obvious that they would not benefit from going to Damascus.[4] Because Mu'āwiya is obeyed there and they will become only his plaything. On the other hand, they had the common aim with Mu'āwiya and that was they had to prevent from Imām's caliphate. Now that Damascus is in the hands of Mu'āwiya, Iraq must be decontrolled by Imām. People like 'Abd Allāh Ibn 'Āmir, who was after rule of Baṣra, insisted more on that. Walīd Ibn 'Uqba is said to have stopped them from going to Damascus since Mu'āwiya was not ready to help 'Uthmān, then how could he leave everything to a guess?[5] Mu'āwiya also faild to take any interest in their coming to Damascus, so he falsely wrote to Zubayr that he has secured allegiance of Damascus people. He asked Zubayr to seize Iraq, Damascus will be ready for him. In that case, there remains nothing for 'Alī. These talks led to their moving on to Baṣra hoping that friends of Ṭalḥa and Zubayr in Baṣra and Kūfa [6] to assist them. Ya'lā Ibn Umayya arriving with a lot of property from Yemen, gave them all to rebels and they mobilized a group and mounted them on Ya'lā Ibn Umayya's horses and moved up to Baṣra.

Referring to the fact that she is Umm al-Mu'minīn and a rightful mother of Muslims, 'Āyisha tried to attract people towards the rebels.[7] When the rebels came to Baṣra, Ka'b Ibn Sūr, leader of Azd tribe, intended to abdicate. 'Āyisha came up to him and invited him. He initially insisting on

---

[1] Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.II, p.224

[2] al-Mu'djam al-Kabīr, vol.24, p.10; Madjma' al-Zawā'id, vol.9, p.135

[3] al-Futūḥ, vol.II, p.286

[4] Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.II, p.221

[5] al-Futūḥ, vol.II, pp.279-280

[6]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.II, pp.221-222

[7]. Nathr al-durr, vol.4, p.15-16

his abdication said that he could not help but fulfilling what his mother said.[1] Anyway, ʻĀyisha's name was very effective in attracting the people.

Later, Ṭalḥa in his speech in Baṣra said, "God has brought ʻĀyisha to you. You know that how dignified she was in front of the Prophet (s) and what status she had in Islam."

Baṣrans just for the sake of ʻĀyisha declared they would defend the rebels.[2]

When fighting began, Ṭalḥa said, "O people! ʻAlī has come to shed the blood of Muslims. Tell not that he is the Messenger's cousin. Someone who is with you is wife of the Prophet and trustworthy Abū Bakr's daughter, she is the one whose father was the most beloved to the Prophet."[3]

On the day of attack, one of Baṣran companions of rebels said in a piece of poetry,

نحن نوالي أمّنا الرضية ونتصر الصّحابة المرضية[4]

"We hold sainthood of our contented mother and help Companions pleased by God."

In Baṣra, ʻAbd Allāh Ibn Ḥukaym Tamīmī, brought to Baṣrans the letters Ṭalḥa wrote to them and used them against ʻUthmān and said to him, "Do you know these letters?"

Ṭalḥa said, "Yes, but I knew repentance and revenging for ʻUthmān the only way to compensate!"[5]

Djamal troops moved on. In midway, in Ḥuw'ab region, ʻĀyisha heard dogs barking. She all of a sudden recalled a report from the Prophet (s) that he kept away his wives from a sedition trap when hearing barking of the dogs on the way. ʻĀyisha became determined to go back but ʻAbd Allāh Ibn Zubayr brought to her fifty people of Banū ʻĀmir to testify that the region was not called Ḥuw'ab.[6]

---

[1].Akhbār al-ṭiwāl, p.144; al-Djamal, p.322

[2]. al-Djamal, p.304

[3]. al-Djamal, p.329

[4]. Ibid. p.345

[5]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.II, pp.229-230; al-Djamal, p.305

[6]. al-Muṣannaf, ʻAbd al-Razzāq, vol.11, p.365; Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.II, p.224; al-Mustadrak, vol.III, p.120; al-Istīʻāb, vol.4, p.361; (Ibn ʻAbd al-Barr says, "This hadith is among the reasons of the Prophet's prophethood and it is more correctly documented requiring no discussion.")

Futūḥ al-buldān, p.549; al-Futūḥ, vol.II, p.288; Nathr al-durr, vol.II, p.227; Madjma' al-Zawā'id, vol.7, p.234

'Uthmān Ibn Ḥunayf was ruler of Baṣra on behalf of Imām (a). He dispatched Abu al-Aswad Du'alī and 'Imrān Ibn Ḥuṣayn to Djamal rebels near Baṣra. They asked Djamal companions why they had gone there.

They replied, "We have come in revenge for 'Uthmān and that the caliphate be left to Shuwrā."

'Uthmān Ibn Ḥunayf ordered the people to bear arms. The rebels came to Baṣra reaching Mirbad region and in there Ṭalḥa first spoke of the oppressedness of 'Uthmān.

He said, "People have sworn allegiance to 'Alī only by force." He further said that now he must abdicate the resign from caliphate and selection of caliph in Shuwrā be the same tradition of 'Umar Ibn Khaṭṭāb.[1]

Zubayr and after him 'Āyisha made speech. Some people acknowledged him and some others shouted that he is telling lies. At this time the crowd parted in two and attacked each other with shoes. This resulted in an armed figting.[2]

One of the opponents, of 'Abd al-Qays great men, cried out, "These people were the harshest against 'Uthmān. After that they swore allegiance to 'Alī and we were told about that and we too did so."

Ṭalḥa ordered to catch him and shaed his head and face.[3] According to Ibn Khayyāṭ, some of the people sheld them with stones when arriving in Baṣra.[4]

At any rate, after relatively controlling Baṣra, they signed a contract with Ibn Ḥunayf saying that they wait for Imām 'Alī to come provided the royal residence, public property and mosque remain in the hands of 'Uthmān Ibn Ḥunayf. Despite the contract being signed, the rebels breached the contract fearing that Imām might come and they could not stand against him, so they nightly marched into the mosque and arrested 'Uthmān Ibn Ḥunayf while he was up at doing the night prayer. They shaved his head and face and overlooked killing him[5], instead expelled him out of the city merely because they feared his brother Sahl Ibn Ḥunayf whom Imām had placed instead of himself. Observing him in this condition, Imām began to cry.[6]

---

[1]. al-Djamal, p.306

[2]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.II, pp.226-227

[3]. al-Djamal, p.307

[4]. Tārikh khalīfat Ibn khayyaṭ, p.182

[5]. al-Djamal, p.284

[6]. Ibid. p.285

The rebels looted the public property after killing about fifty people[1] as well as its watch-outs.

When Ṭalḥa and Zubayr saw the public property, they said, هذا ما وعدنا الله ورسوله!.[2]

According to a narration, Ṭalḥa at the very beginning of his arrival in Baṣra, asked about dhms that had been promised to him.[3]

With the relative control of rebels over Baṣra, there emerged a disagreement between Ṭalḥa and Zubayr over saying the prayers. This conflict temporarily came to an end with a compromise over their saying the prayers each on a day. At this time, Ḥukaym Ibn Djabala, commander of 'Uthmān Ibn Ḥunayf-led forces, began to fight with the rebels with several hundred people. This fighting led to his martyrdom and his three brothers.[4]

From Baṣra, 'Āyisha wrote letters to people of Medina and Yamāma and called them to support Djamal rebels.

In her letter to people of Yamāma, she wrote, "The deviated 'Uthmān Ibn Ḥunayf calls people on the way to hell while we call people to the Book of God."

She had written this letter before Imām's arrival for justifying the crimes of rebels in Baṣra event.[5] She also wrote to Medinans telling them about the victory of rebels in Baṣra. The letter dated Rabi' al-Awwal 5th, 36 H.[6]

When Imām (a) heard about the departure of rebels, he substituted Sahl Ibn Ḥunayf in place of himself and quickly moved to Iraq accompanied by a large number of the Prophet's companions and some other Medinans who are reportedly considered to be four thousand people.[7] According to Sa'īd Ibn Djubayr, eight hundred people of Anṣār and four hundred of those who attended the Riḍwān allegiance, joined Imām (a) in Djamal.[8]

When Imām sent Hāshim Ibn 'Utba Ibn Abī Waqqāṣ from Rabaḍa to tell Abū Mūsā to mobilize people to join Imām. Abū Mūsā disagreed on Kūfiyāns support from Imām. By saying that this is a sedition and being

---

[1]. al-Ma'ārif, p.208

[2] al-Djamal, p.401

[3] al-Muṣannaf, Ibn Abī Shayba, vol.15, p.283

[4] al-Djamal, pp.283-284

[5]. al-Djamal, pp.301-302

[6]. Ibid. pp.299-300

[7]. Tārikh khalīfat Ibn khayyat, p.184

[8]. loc.cit.

absent in sedition is better than attending it[1], he did not allow people to rush to support Imām (a).

In addition, he threatened Hāshim as well. Hāshim came up to Imām and Imām sent 'Abd Allāh and Muḥammad Ibn Abī Bakr to mobilize people in Kūfa, but they failed to do so. This time, Imām sent his son, Imām Ḥasan (a) along with 'Ammār to Kūfa. Besides, he deposed Abū Mūsā and posed Qaraẓa Ibn Ka'b Anṣārī over Kūfa.

The enthusiastic speech of Imām Ḥasan (a) caused nine thousand six hundred and fifty people of Kūfa to join Imām's troops.[2] Ḥudjr Ibn 'Adī, of Kūfa pure and virtuous men called people to support Imām. Afterwards, people were set to back their Imām up under any circumstances.[3] Imām Ḥasan (a) appearing as the Prophet's descendant played a key role in inciting Kūfiyāns. Similarly, 'Ammār, once ruller of Kūfa, was known after piety and people recognized him as a criterion of credal error and gospel truth based on the narration,[4] الحق مع عمّار يدور معه حيث دار

Kūfiyān troops joined Imām in Dhī Qār and moved towards Baṣra.

Baṣran tribes were subdivided in three groups. One group including Rabi'a joined Imām. Another group such as Banū Ḍabba joined 'Āyisha and the other one such as Aḥnaf Ibn Qays, of Banū Tamīm leaders, resigned from the war.[5]

Abdication of a large number of tribes showed that it is very difficult for many to make decisions. Some of the tribes appearing in the two sides brought about to some extent tribal disputes.

Ṭalḥa in his speech in time of war said, "Some of the Muḍarī hypocrite dissidents, Rabi'a Christians and Yemenī foot soldiers helped Imām 'Alī (a).

His speech raised objection of those who had come to war imagining defense of cause of rebels and this made them resign.[6]

Many people deemed rebellion right merely because it was led by Ṭalḥa, Zubayr and 'Āyisha.

---

[1].Akhbār al-ṭiwāl, p.145

[2]. Ibid. p.145; Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.II, pp.234-235

[3]. Akhbār al-ṭiwāl, p.145

[4]. Dīnwarī (Akhbār al-ṭiwāl, p.147) says, "when Zubayr heard that 'Ammār is with Imām 'Alī, he remained doubtful due to hadith of «الحق مع عمار» and hadith «تقتلك الفئة الباغية». This statement seems incorrect thanks to Zubayr's spoiled soul. 'Ammār was from the very beginning with Imām, how has Zubayr not thought of this so far?"

[5]. Concerning the tribes and their positions, Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.II, p.237

[6]. al-Djamal, p.330

Ḥārith Ibn Ḥūṭ told Imām, "Do you think that Ṭalḥa, Zubayr and 'Āyisha are unrightful?"

Imām replied,[1] اعرف الحق تعرف اهله، واعرف الباطل تعرف اهله

Apart from ten thousand Kūfiyāns with two thousand people from 'Abd al-Qays and twelve thousand people comprising Imām's troops,a large number of Baṣran tribes in addition to a great multitude of Medinans among whom there were scores of the Prophet (s)'s companions, accompanied Imām.[2]

Imām 'Alī by no means was willing to wage this war. Hence, three days after arrival in Baṣra, by sending frequent massages, he asked the rebels to join back to "congregation" and "obedience". But he received no positive response from them.[3]

Imām sent Ṣa'ṣa'a Ibn Ṣūḥān with a letter to Baṣra. He spoke with Ṭalḥa and Zubayr but when he talked to 'Āyisha, he felt that she intended to raise wrong doing more than the other two. After Imām's return, 'Abd Allāh Ibn 'Abbās was sent to Baṣra.

He said to Ṭalḥa, "Haven't you sworn allegiance?"

Ṭalḥa said, "I was forced by sword to do so."

Ibn 'Abbās said, "I myself observed that you voluntarily swore an allegiance."

Ṭalḥa spoke about 'Uthmān's blood.

Ibn 'Abbās said, "Was it not true that 'Uthmān drank water from his own house well for ten days? and you did not let him drink fresh water. Then 'Alī came to you asking you to let him drink water."

After that, Ibn 'Abbās talked to 'Āyisha and Ṭalḥa.

'Āyisha was so confident about her victory that she did not show any flexibility.

Ibn 'Abbās attempted by making sound reasoning to warn them of the danger waiting for them, yet they failed to accept it.[4]

However, Imām insisted that war not take place. He stopped his companions launching the war and officially announced that no one has the right to launch war.[5] Even on the day of war, before noon, Imām (a) handed

---

[1]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.II, pp.239,274

[2]. About the attendance of the Prophet's companions, Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.II, pp.267-269 (footnote)

[3]. Akhbār al-ṭiwāl, p.147

[4]. al-Djamal, pp.314-318

[5]. Waq'at al-Djamal, p.36

a Qur'ān to Ibn 'Abbās to go to Ṭalḥa and Zubayr and talk to them while calling them to Qur'ān.

Ibn 'Abbās talked to Ṭalḥa and Zubayr but 'Āyisha even did not permit them to talk and said, "Go and tell your lord that sword will rule between us."

Ibn 'Abbās says, "I was not very far from them when they showered us with their spears."[1]

On the morning of Djamādī al-Awwal 10th [2], Imām's division was prepared. Khurayba was the region of fighting where existed before Baṣra and later it became a place of Baṣra. That day up to noon, Imām resisted against the rebellion troops and advised them.

Imām (a) said to 'Āyisha, "God ordered you to stay at home, fear God and go back."

Imām scolded Ṭalḥa and Zubayr for bringing 'Āyisha. Mālik was placed commander of the right wing, 'Ammār Yāsir as the commander of the left wing, Nu'mān Ibn Rib'ī Anṣārī, according to some sources, Djundab Ibn Zuhayr Azdī was placed over the infantry and the banner was given to Muḥammad Ibn Ḥanafiyya Khariba.

Imām (a) with his fiery speech prepared the troops for battling the enemy.[3]

On the other side, 'Āyisha rode on camel-litter covered with armor. She appeared in the battlefield and made speech regularly talking about the oppressedness of 'Uthmān.

Imām primarily handed a Qur'ān to one of the 'Abd al-Qays people to go to the battlefield calling the rebels to Qur'ān and warning them of disunity. The rebels speared him martyred. Mother of this young man present there jumped herself over her son. The companions helped bring his body to Imām.[4]

Imām (a) who, until that time, had ordered his troops not to launch the war by observing martyrdom of that man commanded Muḥammad Ibn Ḥanafiyya to attack the enemy.[5] Fighting kept on from noon to night. It was most intense around 'Āyisha's camel and as said over seventy hands were

---

[1]. al-Djamal, pp.336-339

[2]. Ibid. p.336; According to Balādhurī, war happened on Djamādī al-Thānī 10th. Ansāb al-ashrāf, p.238; Imām's letter to Kūfiyāns telling about the triumph over Djamal companions is dated Djamādī al-Awwal. al-Djamal, p.399

[3]. al-Djamal, p.334

[4]. al-Djamal, pp.339-340; al-Muṣannaf, Ibn Abī Shayba, vol.7, p.537; Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.II, p.241

[5]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.II, pp.240-241

amputated wanting to reach her camel's reins. 'Āyisha picked a handful of soil and tried to stupify people and did just as the Prophet (s) had done. She spattered the soil towards Imām's troops and said, "Woe betide you!"

Imām said to her, وَمَا رَمَيْتَ إِذْ رَمَيْتَ وَلَكِنَّ اللَّهَ رَمَى.[1] "One who speared was not thee but the devil."

When rebelling troops were defeated, Marwān Ibn Ḥakam knowing that the murderer of 'Uthmān is nobody but Ṭalḥa, speared him killed.[2]

Interestingly, Ibn Khayyāṭ says, "Once the war was begun, the first one killed was Ṭalḥa.[3] This shows that Marwān mainly has come to war to kill Ṭalḥa. Later on, he felt proud of this such that he himself told the story to Imām Sadjdjād (a).[4]

It has been said that Imām (a) called Ṭalḥa in a battlefield and said to him, "Go Abū Muḥammad! Do you remember what the Prophet said about me?" اللهم وال من والاه وعاد من عاداه "O Allāh! Love his friends and loathe his enemies." Ṭalḥa replied, "I ask the repentance from God! If I had remembered that, I would have never risen up.[5]

Zubayr stayed with the troops to the insistence of his son, 'Abd Allāh and did not leave the battlefield even with the Imām's speech. In one case, Imām (a) remembered what the Prophet had said, "Your aunt's son, that is Zubayr, will rebel against you."

Zubayr acknowledged the report.[6]

The sources saying that Zubayr anyway had run away from the stage of fighting[7] or had deserted the battlefield while being remorseful, are in clash with each other.

After Imām's speech, Zubayr intended to go back, but returned to the battlefield by the insistence of his son, it is probable that this might have caused his last run away to be assumed as his repentance. While if he were really remorseful, he would make his serious decision to return in the very beginning. When he left the battlefield, a person named Ibn Djurmūz chased and killed him in the right occasion.

---

[1]. al-Djamal, p.348; Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, vol.I, p.257

[2]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.II, p.246-247

[3]. Tārīkh khalīfat Ibn khayyāṭ, p.185

[4]. al-Djamal, p.383

[5]. Waq'at al-Djamal, al-Ghallābī, p.42; Tārīkh Mukhtaṣar Dimashq, vol.11, p.204

[6]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.II, p.255; Akhbār al-ṭiwāl, p.147

[7]. Abū Mikhnaf comments that Zubayr left the battlefield after troops failure and he was killed on his way to Medina. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.I, p.254; This means that he has left the battlefield and nothing else.

Imām said about him, "Zubayr was closer to me than Ṭalḥa. He was always from us, Ahl al-Bayt, so long as his son 'Abd Allāh grew up and separated us."[1]

Mālik played a role in Imām's caliphate as much as when he came in grips with 'Abd Allāh Ibn Zubayr, he was almost to kill him but in front of those of his troops whom he was separated from, 'Abd Allāh said, "Kill me with Mālik Ashtar."[2] His purpose was to have Mālik killed.

'Adī Ibn Ḥātim Ṭā'ī was among Imām's defenders who lost both one eye and one of his sons in this war. 'Amr Ibn Ḥimaq Khuzā'ī was another companion of the Prophet (s) who stayed close to Imām in this war. He was, according to Dīnwarī, among the pious people of Kūfa and many pious people joined him.[3]

Observing the resistance of Baṣrans around Djamal, Imām ordered the camel to be killed. Some of Imām's companions surrounded the camel and killed it.

Later on, 'Āyisha said, "I could see 'Alī from inside the camel litter who was engaged in war shouting, al-Djamal, al-Djamal."[4]

Imām neared the camel litter and blamed 'Āyisha addressing her, "Ya Shaqīrā'." [5]

One point is worth saying that 'Āyisha watched outside from inside the camel litter through the hole made.

Once she asked a person who had the reins of the camel in hand, "Is 'Alī present among the people?"

He replied, "Yes."

'Āyisha asked him to show 'Alī to her. When 'Alī was shown to her, she said, "How identical he is to his brother!"

The man questioned, "Whom do you mean?"

She said, "The Prophet."

Once the man heard that, he let the camel's reins loose and joined Imām's troops.[6]

After the war came to an end, 'Āyisha who was motionless like a stiff, was taken out and sent along with her brother, Muḥammad Ibn Abī Bakr, to

---

[1]. al-Djamal, p.389; Mukhtaṣar Tārīkh Dimashq, vol.9, p.24

[2]. Akhbār al-ṭiwāl, p.150

[3]. loc.cit.

[4].Al-Djamal, p.379

[5]. Ibid. p.369

[6]. Samṭ al-Nudjūm al-'Awālī, vol.II, p.440

Baṣra and after some days she could leave there. Afterwards, she was sent to Medina with a number of Baṣran men and women.[1] A long time after, ʻĀyisha frequently expressed remorse of what she had done.[2] When she read the verse, وقرن في بيوتكن she cried so much that her veil became wet.[3]

Ibn Qutayba says, "A woman came to ʻĀyisha and said, What do you say about the woman who has killed her little child?"

ʻĀyisha said, "She must go to hell."

The woman said, "What do you say about the woman who has killed (that is ʻĀyisha) twenty thousand of her elder children?"[4]

ʻĀyisha herself when dying, said, "I have created events after the Prophet. Bury me near other wives (rather than beside the Prophet)."[5]

According to another narration, ʻĀyisha said, "My absence in Djamal was better than having ten sons of the Prophet."[6]

Many Baṣrans from different tribes were killed in this war. According to Balādhurī, only two thousand five hundred and fifty two people of Azd tribe were killed.

Eight hundred from Bakr Ibn Wā'il, five hundred from Banū Ḍabba and seven hundred people from Banū Tamīm had been killed.[7]

There seem to be other exaggerative numbers given. For example, Djamal war victims are said to be totally twenty thousand people.[8]

ʻAbd Allāh Ibn Zubayr also says that there have been fifteen thousand people killed.

According to Shiykh Mufīd, the same number of twenty thousand people seems correct.[9]

Abū Ḥātim Nāmī quoting from his grandfather that the people killed in Djamal numbered twenty thousand people.[10]

---

[1]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.II, p.249

[2]. Ibid. vol.II, p.265

[3]. Ibid. vol.II, p.266

[4]. ʻUyūn al-akhbār, vol.I, p.202

[5]. Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā, vol.8, p.74

[6]. al-Futūḥ, vol.II, p.241; Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā, vol.5, p.6

[7]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.II, p.248

[8]. Ibid. vol.II, p.265

[9]. al-Djamal, p.419

[10]. Tārikh khalīfat Ibn khayyāṭ, p.186

This number seems incorrect because in a war lasting only five to six hours, there could be not many casualties to this extent. Imām's troops martyrs are said to number between four hundred to five hundred people.[1]

Known figures among martyrs of Imām's companions number six. Among them, Zayd and Sayḥān are children of Ṣawhān. There are two more people called Ṣaq'ab and 'Abd Allāh, brothers of Sālim Ibn Mikhnaf (Abū Mikhnaf's grandfather) as well as two others named 'Albā' Ibn Ḥārith Sadūsī and Hind Djamalī.[2]

What is certain is that the immediate defeat of Baṣra troops (five hundred people killed compared to over nineteen thousand people of the rebels killed) shows that rebelling troops had no strong incentives although Umm al-Mu'minīn was present among them. Major problem was that Ṭalḥa and 'Āyisha despite the fame they won in the affair of 'Uthmān, were more notorious than that they can deceive people of Baṣra considering themselves as avengers for 'Uthmān.

After the war was put to an end, Imām (a) ordered his troops not to chase anybody. Whoever gave in, he shall not be killed and no wounded shall be murdered. Imām set free even people like Marwān and children of 'Uthmān.

At that time, Marwān said, "He will not swear allegiance unless he is forced to do so."

Imām said, "Even if he swears allegiance, like Jews, he will violate his allegiance." [3]

Imām did not let people take advantage of private property of people except what the enemy had used in war. This was amazing to the people who up to now gained booties after any victorious war. Imām was objected concerningly, and he ashamed them by saying that who would take 'Āyisha if the property is to be shared?

However, simple-minded Arabs had this problem in mind that how it is rightly possible to kill people of a tribe but their property seizure is forbidden.[4]

Imām (a) began to search among those killed. When he saw Ka'b Ibn Thur-former judge of Baṣra on behalf of 'Umar-he had Qur'ān hang from his neck. Imām said to take Qur'ān off his neck.

He then ordered to have Ka'b be seated in front of him, and talked to his dead body just as the prophet had done to Quraysh's killed people in Uḥud,

---

[1]. Tārīkh khalīfat Ibn khayyāṭ, p.186

[2]. Ibid. p.190

[3]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.II, p.263 (context and footnote)

[4]. Akhbār al-ṭiwāl, p.151

"O Ka'b! I found what my God had promised. You also found what your God had promised you!"[1]

After Djamal fracas came to an end, Imām (a) entered congregation mosque and began to reproach the Baṣran infidels who were the first people standing against their Imām.

Imām called them[2] womanish troops and animal followers جند المراةَ واتباع البهيمةَ.

Imām wrote in letters to Medina and Kūfa about the story of Baṣra.[3] Then he ordered to have the public property shared among his companions who are said to number twelve thousand people. Unlike Ṭalḥa and Zubayr who said when observing Bayt al-Māl, "This is the same promise of God and his messenger", this time Imām (a) said, "O white and yellow jewels, deceive people but me."[4]

After some time, sojourning in Baṣra, Imām went up to Kūfa on Monday, Radjab 12th or 16th, year 36 H.[5] after appointing 'Abd Allāh Ibn 'Abbās as the ruler of Baṣra. His arrival in Kūfa is said to be on Monday, 12th of Radjab.[6]

IMĀM STAYS IN KŪFA

Imām departed to Kūfa after subsiding rebellion of infidels. Imām stayed over in Kūfa until his martyrdom. It is outlandish to say that Imām generally decided to leave Medina, although it is even far from fact his return to Medina might have been possible after his stay in Kūfa. His departure to Kūfa has to be considered as some kind of action to safeguard religion from the harm of infidels such as Mu'āwiya. Iraq was in a touchy situation. In principal, after beginning of conquests and expansion of Islamic realm, two points triggered increased importance of Damascus and Iraq over Medina and in other words Ḥidjāz. First, a large number of tribes had come to Damascus and Iraq from Ḥidjāz among whom there were seen many of companions. Second, the extent, possibilities and hidden talents in this regions had been incomparable to Ḥidjāz. When infidel rebels began their movement in Mecca, they well came to this conclusion to move towards Iraq

---

[1]. al-Djamal, p.392

[2]. Akhbār al-ṭiwāl, p.151; al-Djamal, p.407; Rabi' al-abrār, vol.I, p.308

[3]. al-Djamal, pp.395-399

[4]. Ibid. pp.401-402

[5]. al-Futūḥ, vol.II, p.374; Akhbār al-ṭiwāl, p.152; Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.II, p.273; It is to be said that Imām has written letter to Qaraẓa Ibn Ka'b, ruler of Kūfa, to inform about the victory in Radjab 36 H. al-Djamal, p.404

[6]. Akhbār al-ṭiwāl, p.153

before 'Alī (a) captures it. In case they could succeed in seizing Kūfa and Baṣra, Ḥidjāz would come in their hands. The problem was that they first assumed power in Baṣra but an incomplete one. Second, Kūfa was taken totally out of their control. In contrast, Imām could bring Kūfa under his control, placing it as a base for his Shi'ite Muslims in the future. Regretfully, the same action of the infidel rebels caused Baṣra not only to tilt towards 'Uthmānī religion but there emerges a permanent enmity between Baṣra and Kūfa in Iraq, fading out solidarity in this region.

It was not easy for Imām to get out of Madīnat al-Nabī and there was no way out just as when the Prophet (s) left Mecca with all sanctity and his sense of patriotism. In that time, he had not so many followers in Mecca. In contrast, Medina bowed to him knowing that it was economically reliable. Now Imām 'Alī (a) had felt that his two strong enemies, one having Damascus in control and another Baṣra, trying to take Kūfa out of his control. Seizure of these two cities meant that the whole Iran with all of its economic capacities has come under their control. Imām (a) was not the man to become discouraged in the face of these problems and to abdicate from caliphate, something the rebels thought of and imagined that Imām leaves the affairs to Shuwrā by observing this condition. On the contrary, he was determined to fight with the rebels and for the same reason he swiftly moved towards Iraq.

The major reason was that Medina could not stand and resist for some factors.

First, economically speaking, Ḥidjāz was unable to bear confrontation with Iraq or Damascus. Medina, the best region, could not properly meet the needs of its people. Now how could it feed a huge army?

Second, Medina was not able to endure an all-out war with Damascus in terms of human power. The maximum number of those Medinans who aided Imām (a) in Djamal war is four thousand people.[1] This population could not undo the problems of succession in facing his plenty of enemies.

Third, Medinans save Anṣār were not so much interested in Imām 'Alī (a). Muhādjirun (immigrants), their children as well as Meccans were great number of people who had departed to this city after departure of the Prophet (s). Families of the Umayyads and those of Djamal rebels did not allow people to completely assist Imām (a). The people of this city, during 'Uthmān period, suffering from increased desire of welfare took away their fighting spirit. Moreover, the citizens, particularly some companions, like 'Abd Allāh Ibn 'Umar, Sa'd Ibn Abī Waqqāṣ, Muḥammad Ibn Maslama, Usāma Ibn Zayd, Zayd Ibn Thābit and many others did not show the least interest to Imām (a), knowing themselves more religious jurist than that they

---

[1]. Tārikh khalīfat Ibn khayyāṭ, p.184

lend an ear to his speech. When Imām was in Kūfa, Sahl Ibn Ḥunayf, Imām's ruler in Kūfa, told Imām that many people are attracted by Mu'āwiya.

Imām in a letter wrote to Sahl, I have been told that people staying with you some of whom secretly go to Mu'āwiya. Do not feel sorry that number of your men is decreased and their assistance is stopped. Their deviation and your release from their suffering suffice to say that they are escaping from the truth and rushing to ignorance. They are people of this world and they are after it. They have seen and heard the justice and knew that people are equal in front of justice. So, they ran away to have their own ends meet alone. May they be far from the blessing of God.[1] Meccans had no better situation either. When Imām (a) wrote to Khālid Ibn 'Āṣ to secure allegiance from Meccans but they refused to do so.[2]

Kūfa in different ways and just in the face of Medina had an entirely good condition. In the first place, Iraq had no problem of population. There were many tribes living there, those who had shown their military power in conquering Iran. Iraq economically was the most important source for people of this land. Furthermore, there were a lot of tax and tribute from Iran and Iraq, an unlimited wealth, in the hands of Muslims. When 'Uqba Ibn 'Āmir asked Imām not to leave Medina and get somebody else to go.

Imām said, إن الأموال والرجال بالعراق[3] "The properties and the men are in Iraq."

This was quite clear for others. 'Abd Allāh Ibn 'Āmir leaving Baṣra for Mecca after 'Uthmān was murdered, he was told in a piece of poetry by Walīd Ibn 'Uqba, "You left Iraq, center of men and came to a silent city!"[4]

Ibn A'tham presents importance of Iraq as if Damascus has been only a corner of it.[5] Fundamental aim of Imām (a) was to face Mu'āwiya after stifling of Djamal rebellion. It was impossible to do this without Imām's appearance in Iraq that was near Damascus.[6] Besides, Imām had a lot of supporters from among Yemenī tribes who were actually his devotees. They played a very important role in the war when Imām assumed caliphate and they stood in all battle scenes to the very end.

Of course it is to be noted that Iraq had its own specific problems. Later on, more explanation will be given about Iraqis on the occasion of confusion

---

1. Nahdj al-balāgha, letter 70
2. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.II, pp.210-211
3. Akhbār al-ṭiwāl, p.143; al-Futūḥ, vol.II, p.268; al-Mi'yār wa l-Muwāzina, p.98
4. al-Futūḥ, vol.II, p.271
5. al-Futūḥ, vol.I, p.134
6. Mu'djam al-buldān, vol.I, p.47

in this city at the beginning of Imām Ḥasan (a)'s succession. It is only to refer that Kūfiyāns were recognized the most controversial people over trifles. They were enthusiastic people and not showing moderation in this regard. Also, the strong force of tribes headmen was one of the serious problems of Imām during his caliphate.

WAR WITH OPPRESSIVELY PERVERSE PEOPLE IN ṢIFFĪN

Upon his arrival in Kūfa, Imām did not go to ruler's palace. The palace, in many years, had been converted to an aristocratic one.

When Imām was asked to go there, he said, "I'll never go to palace of the owls."

He then went to altar of Kūfa mosque and temporarily resided there. Afterwards, he went to Dju'da's house, son of his sister, Umm Hānī.[1]

Kūfiyāns as the victorious people in Baṣra warmly red-carpetted Imām.[2] At this time Damascus was the most important problem for Imām to think of.

From the years before Imām assumed caliphate, Damascus belonged to the Umayyads. Perhaps 'Umar who had placed Damascus at the discretion of Yazīd and next Mu'āwiya, children of Abū Sufyān, thought that the Umayyads deserve having Damascus if not rightful of seizing caliphate but because they were leaders of Quraysh. Henceforth, as earlier said, he did not make any changes to Damascus and even never remained critical of Mu'āwiya. With the arrivel of 'Uthmān, Mu'āwiya was completely stabilized in situation. At this time, he regarded Damascus to be his own kinghood and mainly the imagination that he someday is deposed never occurred to him. Mu'āwiya was very vigilant to have Damascus people be mentally fed by him and not by any other people. For the same reason he never let Abūdhar stay there. Subsequently, whoever came to Damascus intending to effect the minds of the people as Mu'āwiya thought, he would be expelled out of there.[3] Anti-'Uthmān rebellion on the part of the companions and other people made him treat the case cautiously. On one

---

[1]. Waq'at Ṣiffīn, pp.3,5; al-Futūḥ, vol.II, p.349. It is to be said that the most comprehensive work on the event of Ṣiffīn is the valuable book "Waq'at Ṣiffīn", written by Naṣr Ibn Muzāḥim, dead in 212. Ibn A'tham has mainly used this book in reporting about Ṣiffīn and he has condensed the book. Sources such as Tārikh al-ṭabarī and Balādhurī have quoted mainly from Abū Mikhnaf except a few sporadic reports.

[2]. al-Futūḥ, vol.II, p.347

[3]. Ibid. vol.II, pp.360-361

hand, he never decided to stand against the companions. In this case, it was hoped that if someone came to power, he would have no pretext to demote Mu'āwiya because of supporting the deviated caliph. On the other hand, with the confidence Mu'āwiya took in Damascus people, he could count on this point that he would have an excuse for rebellion given the fact that he is being set aside. It happened to be so.

Having come to power, Imām (a) was up to send 'Abd Allāh Ibn 'Abbās to rule over Damascus. He primarily wrote a letter to Mu'āwiya in which he asked Mu'āwiya to accompany the aristocrats of Damascus to Medina, informing him that people murdered 'Uthmān without his consultation but now they have selected him as caliph with consultation and consensus.

Mu'āwiya failed to reply Imām's letter and he only sent him a white letter writing, "From Mu'āwiya to 'Alī Ibn Abī Ṭālib."

Someone who had carried the letter to Imām (a) said, "I am coming from the people who believe that you have murdered 'Uthmān and they are pleased with nothing else but killing you."[1]

This story was linked to the beginning affair of Djamal rebels that engaged Imām's mind for some time. In this time, the story of Djamal provided Mu'āwiya with another propagandistic chance. By referring to turbulence of Ṭalḥa, Zubayr and 'Āyisha, as the Prophet's wife, he could fix Imām's having a hand in murder of 'Uthmān in the minds of Damascus people better than before.

After Djamal story came to an end, Imām (a) settled in Kūfa because it was obvious that he would soon fight with Damascus troops. In this case, it was only Iraq that could do such a thing. In the very moment Imām arrived in Kūfa, Shann Ibn 'Abd Qays composed, "Now we are relieved from war with the infidels, but there is a horrendous snake in Damascus that if stinks anyone, he'll be filled with a dead fatal venom in his body; therefore, in order to remedy, before it stinks, smash its head and throw it aside.[2]

It is to be noted that challenge between Damascus and Iraq, in principle, predated the Sassanids period. Arabs of these two regions, each was engaged in fighting in support of one of the two great powers of that time, that is Romans and the Sassanids. Of course, presently new immigrants entered this region and had different incentives compared to the past, but the old grounds could also affect it. Damascus surrender meant that its people had yielded to Iraqis. This could be true in the other way round. Ka'b Ibn Dju'ayl composed,

أرى الشام تكره ملك العراق وأهل العراق لها كارهونا

---

[1]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.II, pp.211-212

[2]. Waq'at Ṣiffin, p 8.

وكل لصاحبه مبغض يرى كلّ ما كان من ذاك دينا[1]

"Damascus people dislike Iraq's rulership and so do Iraqis, they call each other enemies and dismiss each other's doings as bad."

This was not an easy confrontation and it was clear from scratch that Iraqis and Damascus people will have hard days ahead.

'Amr Ibn 'Āṣ, some time in the midst of Ṣiffīn war, wrote to Ibn 'Abbās, "The situation has become very critical and know that, إن الشام لا تملك الا بهلاك العراق، وأن العراق لا تملك إلا بهلاك الشام.[2] "Damascus is only captured by destroying the Iraqis and so is Iraq by killing Damascus people."

Shurahbīl Ibn Simṭ objected to Imām's envoy saying that, "You have come to annex Damascus to Iraq?"[3]

In this time, other towns except Damascus and its suburbs swore allegiance to Imām [4] and Imām in Kūfa designated rulers for different regions of Iraq and Iran.[5] Mālik Ashatar was dispatched to Djazīra (including Mūṣil, Naṣībayn, Dārā, Sindjār, Āmid, Hit and 'Ānāt). This region was specifically a key region because it was situated near Damascus and Ḍaḥḥāk Ibn Qays was in power there on behalf of Mu'āwiya. Djazīra people held 'Uthmānī religion[6] and those of "the 'Uthmānids" having fled from Kūfa and Baṣra, had taken shelter in some parts of Djazīra cominated by Mu'āwiya.[7] Ḍaḥḥāk-controled regions included cities of Raqqa, Ruhā and Qirqīsiyā'. When Mālik Ashtar went to Djazīra, he prepared troops and attacked Ḥarān. He had an intense fighting with Ḍaḥḥāk troops in this invasion. He could bring this region under his control.[8]

It goes to say that Imām (a) on his arrival in Kūfa tried to brighten public minds about different matters and prepare them for supporting him in the subsequent developments. He talked to the great people and noblemen and asked their support for himself against Mu'āwiya. Iraq was then dominated by the same noblemen. Headmen of tribes were more powerful than the ruler of the city and Imām (a) could not reorganize things without attracting their attention. At the same time, Imām's procedure was not to make progress in the affairs without consultation of people. This for people with no political

---

[1]. Waq'at Ṣiffīn, p.56; al-Futūḥ, vol.II, p.432; Akhbār al-ṭiwāl, p.160

[2]. Waq'at Ṣiffīn, p.411

[3]. al-Futūḥ, vol.II, p.403

[4]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.II, p.212

[5]. Waq'at Ṣiffīn, pp.12-13

[6]. al-Futūḥ, vol.II, p.350

[7]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.II, p.297

[8]. al-Futūḥ, vol.II, p.350; Waq'at Ṣiffīn, p.113; Akhbār al-ṭiwāl, p.167

perception created more desire of cooperation. In response to Imām who said that he intended to write a letter to Mu'āwiya calling to his obedience, people said, "Whatever you do, we obey you. We obey you just as we obeyed the Prophet." [1] Imām also decided to reveal the fact to those rulers of the cities who were appointed by 'Uthmān and had no certain problems. Included among them were Djarīr Ibn 'Abd Allāh Badjalī, ruler of Hamadān and Ash'ath Ibn Qays, ruler of Ādharbāydjān.

According to Dīnwarī, one of the reasons of anti-'Uthmān rebellion was to give rulership of Ādharbāydjān to Ash'ath. This happened after 'Uthmān married Ash'ath's daughter to his son.[2] Ash'ath decided to flee to Damascus and only the shame he had from the side of his friends and their opposition to this action he took caused him to stay there.[3] Noblemen of Kūfa and other parts were given an audience by Imām and made excuses for justifying their no support of Imām in Djamal while strengthening their allegiance to him. Speaking about preparing to join Mu'āwiya was something they were engaged in. for example, cooperation of Aḥnaf Ibn Qays on behalf of Imām led to coming of Banū Sa'd and Banū Tamīm tribes to Kūfa from Baṣra and this largely affected consolidation of Kūfa[4].

By sending a letter to Mu'āwiya from Kūfa, Imām attempted to convince him to obey Imām of Muslims. Imām in a letter told him that his caliphate was based on then criteria and he had to admit it. Imām wrote, "verily the allegiance people in Medina swore to me is mandatory for you in Damascus too. The same people who had sworn allegiance to Abū Bakr, 'Umar and 'Uthmān have done so to me similarly, so everybody present here has no way but to decide upon allegiance and everyone absent has no alternative except abandoning it. Shuwrā is the right of Muhādjirūn and Anṣār and when it is formed and the members agreed on leadership of a man called Imām, then this is the very consent of God[5]...if you are rebellious, I'll fight you asking help of God. You've talked a lot about murderers of 'Uthmān. First, go on the way Muslims cover and come with them to me for trial, so I oblige you and them to follow Book of God...and know that you're released

---

[1]. al-Futūḥ, vol.II, p.352

[2]. Akhbār al-ṭiwāl, p.156

[3]. Waq'at Ṣiffīn, p.21; al-Futūḥ, vol.II, pp.370-371

[4]. Waq'at Ṣiffīn, p.27

[5].'Abd al-Raḥmān Ibn Ghanm Azdī who was known as "Afqah ahl Shām"(Horizon of Damascus people) said to Shuraḥbīl in Damascus, "Even if 'Alī has murdered 'Uthmān, he would be caliph of Muslims since Muhādjirūn and Anṣār have sworn allegiance to him and they are "superior to people". Waq'at Ṣiffīn, p.45

on parole and the liberated prisoners do not deserve caliphate and participating in Shuwrā".[1]

When Djarīr Ibn 'Abd Allāh handed Imām's letter to Mu'āwiya in which he asked him to stop his seditious actions and join the community of Muslims, Mu'āwiya asked people to assemble in the mosque.

While praising Damascus as "sacred territory", he said, "I am your caliph on behalf of 'Umar Ibn Khaṭṭāb and 'Uthmān. I am guardian for blood of 'Uthmān who has been oppressedly killed. What do you say about blood of 'Uthmān?"

All people declared their support of his revenge for 'Uthmān. This was Mu'āwiya's response to Imām (a). What was more interesting in Mu'āwiya's speech was that he said he had been appointed to rule Damascus on behalf of 'Umar.[2]

'Uthmān also said, "How should I depose Mu'āwiya from Damascus while 'Umar has appointed him?"

This was while he had demoted many of 'Umar's agents from different cities.[3] By deceiving Shuraḥbīl Simṭ Kindī, one of Damascus noblemen and headman of Yemenis[4], Mu'āwiya could draw support of many of Damascus people.[5] Mu'āwiya regularly sent people to him to give testimony that 'Alī has murdered 'Uthmān. Account of this deception shows stupidity of Shuraḥbīl and those who followed him and Mu'āwiya.[6]

Mu'āwiya told Djarīr Ibn 'Abd Allāh, representative of Imām, "Write to 'Alī to set Damascus and Egypt for me and when he passed away, he should not leave allegiance of anybody to me. In this case, I entrust everything to him and know him a caliph." Djarīr wrote this to Imām and Imām replied, "Mughīra in Medina suggested this to me and I rejected. I do not do such a thing because, لم يكن الله ليراني أتخذ المضلين عضداً "God never sees me in a position of taking advantage of the deviators as my arms."[7]

In fact, Mu'āwiya tended to capture Damascus unequivocally and even if Imām 'Alī is caliph, the region should be in his control in the form of an

---

[1]. Waq'at Ṣiffīn, p.29; al-Futūḥ, vol.II, pp.374-375; Akhbār al-ṭiwāl, p.157

[2]. al-Futūḥ, vol.II, p.380

[3]. Waq'at Ṣiffīn, p.32

[4]. al-Futūḥ, vol.II, p.411, he was proud not because of being from Damascus but because he was a Yemeni.

[5]. al-Futūḥ, vol.II, pp.406-407; Akhbār al-ṭiwāl, p.160

[6]. Waq'at Ṣiffīn, pp.44-52; al-Futūḥ, vol.II, pp.397-401; Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.II, p.275-276 (footnote); Akhbār al-ṭiwāl, p.159

[7]. Waq'at Ṣiffīn, p.52; al-Futūḥ, vol.II, p.392

independent emirate. When Mu'āwiya made speech in Damascus, he said, "Why is 'Alī in caliphate superior to me. If Ḥidjāz people have sworn allegiance to him, Damascus people have done so to me. These two regions are equal in this regard."

He also in a letter wrote to Imām, "As long as people of Ḥidjāz observe the truth, they were more preferred than Damascus people. But now since they have abandoned the truth, the truth belongs to the Damascus people."[1]

Replying him, Imām wrote, "As for what you said about "now people of Damascus are superior to people of Ḥidjāz", show me a man from Quraysh who can be approved in Shuwrā or his caliphate can be legal. If you claim so, Muhādjirūn and Anṣār deny you ... allegiance to me is generally sworn and nobody can oppose it and there will be no revision." [2]

At this time, Mu'āwiya was called emir rather than "Amīr al-Mu'minīn" in Damascus; nevertheless, there were people who applied this term to Mu'āwiya. The first man to call Mu'āwiya Amīr al-Mu'minīn was Ḥadidjadj Ibn Khuzayma who in his first meeting with Mu'āwiya said, "Your uncles descendants from Banū 'Abd al-Muṭallib killed your Shiykh." [3]

However, Djarīr Ibn 'Abd Allāh Badjalī returned from Damascus to Kūfa after four months.[4] Mālik punished him hard and blamed him for selling his religion to Mu'āwiya in Damascus. A short while later, Djarīr left Kūfa for Qirqīsa while a large number of people from Badjala-excluding nineteen people–joined him. After Djarīr along with Thuwayr Ibn 'Āmir left for the place, Imām set ablaze their houses.[5]

This time, 'Amr Ibn 'Āṣ lived in Palestine. He stood aside and went to Palestine after his opposition to 'Uthmān that essentially emanated from 'Abd Allāh Ibn Sa'd Ibn Abī Sarḥ who was put in his place in Egypt. From there, he provoked people and even serfs against 'Uthmān.[6] He is said after murder of 'Uthmān to have asked his children what he must do.

His son said, "Go to 'Alī."

'Amr said, "If I go to 'Alī now, he'll say, "You are like one of the Muslims enjoying equal rights as they do", "but Mu'āwiya considers me as his partner."[7]

---

[1]. al-Futūḥ, vol.II, pp.429-430

[2]. Waq'at Ṣiffīn, p.58; al-Futūḥ, vol.II, p.432

[3]. Waq'at Ṣiffīn, p.77

[4]. al-Futūḥ, vol.II, p.404

[5]. Waq'at Ṣiffīn, p.61

[6]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.II, p.283

[7]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.II, p.284; Akhbār al-ṭiwāl, p.157

Mu'āwiya felt that he could be of an important help to him. At the same time, Mu'āwiya as in all cases, by touching 'Amr's weak point that is government of Egypt, asked his accompaniment. Mu'āwiya, it is said, asked 'Amr to rush to him after he received Imām's letter through Djarīr Ibn 'Abd Allāh.[1] It is also said that his son, 'Abd Allāh, bewared him of his action [2], but Muḥammad, his another son, induced him to do that. 'Amr himself expressed his initial hesitation in a piece of poetry.[3]

However, 'Amr Ibn 'Āṣ was more corrupt than to overlook government of Egypt. He was primarily one member of Abū Bakr and 'Umar's band. He commanded the conquests and 'Uthmān had set him aside because he used the help of his relatives in this regard. In essence, 'Amr was one of the organs of Quraysh party who was at odds with the Hāshimites. He quickly made his decision and joined hands with Mu'āwiya after being assured that he could gain the world, that according to him was government of Egypt, by selling his religion. Talking to Mu'āwiya, he composed,

معاوي لا اعطيك ديني ولم أنل بذلك دنيا فانظر كيف تصنع
فإن تعطني مصراً فأربح بصفقة أخذت بها شيخاً يضرّ وينفع[4]

"O Mu'āwiya! I sell not my religion for you and I sought not a benefit from your world, now this is you and all this, so if you give rulership of Egypt to me, I am fully benefitted."

It was a great success for Mu'āwiya to see 'Amr joining him. The first thing Mu'āwiya consulted was about Roman troops. 'Amr proposed a compromise and said that Romans would quickly accept it.[5] Mu'āwiya put this into effect and Imām (a) mentioned it in one of his speeches.[6] 'Ubayd Allāh Ibn 'Umar joining Mu'āwiya in Damascus-that was because he feared Imām retaliating him for murder of Hurmuzān and two other people in

---

[1]. al-Futūḥ, vol.II, p.382

[2]. In Sunnites sources 'Abd Allāh Ibn 'Amr Ibn 'Āṣ, one of Ṣaḥāba hadith-writers, is defended while 'Abd Allāh was present in Ṣiffīn arm in arm with his father. 'Abd Allāh commanded the left wing of Damascus troops. Waq'at Ṣiffīn, p.206. It goes to say that when his father asked him to hold the banner, he first rejected and said, "I'll never fight anyone who has not been even one moment an atheist." His father obligated him to hold the banner, he took it and said, "If the Prophet had not said, "Obey your father", "I would have never done this!!" al-Futūḥ, vol.II, p.35

[3]. Waq'at Ṣiffīn, p.35; Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.II, p.285; Tārikh al-ya'qūbī, vol.II, p.185

[4]. Waq'at Ṣiffīn, p.39; Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.II, p.288; Tārikh al-ya'qūbī, vol.II, p.186. 'Amr lived only until 43 H. and was ruler of Egypt.

[5]. Waq'at Ṣiffīn, pp.37,44; al-Futūḥ, vol.II, p.386

[6]. al-Futūḥ, vol.II, p.441

Medina[1]-complemented Mu'āwiya's excuse in having son of caliph II in his hands and this was publicly and highly important to Mu'āwiya who counted on this.[2]

Mu'āwiya began his propaganda for betraying people of Medina and Mecca as well as the renowned authorities in different cities. He wrote to Medinans that we have risen up in revenge for 'Uthmān. If we become victorious, we will settle everything as Shuwrā manipulated by 'Umar and we are not after caliphate. Medinans were irritated by what Mu'āwiya and 'Amr said about caliphate and mentioned this important principle to them that "Ṭulaqā" (those released on parole) have no right to speak about caliphate.[3] Mu'āwiya made an effort to deceive people like Sa'd Ibn Abī Waqqāṣ, 'Abd Allāh Ibn 'Umar, Muḥammad Ibn Maslama and Usāma Ibn Zayd whom he heard had not sworn allegiance to Imām (a) or had been unwilling to obey him in his wars. He in these letters regularly talked about Shuwrā. None of the people mentioned responded him favorably.

Sa'd Waqqāṣ also wrote, "'Umar let no body in Shuwrā unless those who were rightful of the caliphate. Presently, there is some disagreement with 'Alī on the fact that it would be good if Ṭalḥa and Zubayr stayed home."[4]

We know that the bottom line of all Sa'd's speech was that he deserved caliphate because 'Alī (a) has a problem and others are all dead. The only person remaining is Sa'd Waqqāṣ!

'Alī's idea about "Qā'idīn" was that, خذلوا الحق ولم ينصروا الباطل "These people downgraded the gospel truth and assisted not the credal error."[5]

Mu'āwiya wrote to 'Abd Allāh Ibn 'Umar, "He does not want caliphate for himself but he wants it for you. 'Abd Allāh rejected his suggestion."[6]

This time, Imām (a) and Mu'āwiya exchanged two detaile letters which contained important points.

Mu'āwiya in his letter wrote to Imām that, "After the Prophet there were caliphs who came to power and you were envious of them and rebelled against them and we realized that rebellion in your wrathful look, your outcry, your sigh and in your delayed allegiance to caliphs, seeing that you were pulled like a male nose-ringed two-humped camel by force to reluctantly pay allegiance to them."

---

[1]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.II, p.294; Akhbār al-ṭiwāl, p.161

[2]. Waq'at Ṣiffīn, pp.82-83; al-Futūḥ, vol.II, p.413

[3]. Waq'at Ṣiffīn, p.63; al-Futūḥ, vol.II, pp.416-417

[4]. Waq'at Ṣiffīn, vol.75; Tārikh al-ya'qūbī, vol.II, p.187; al-Futūḥ, vol.II, p.421

[5]. Nahdj al-balāgha, catchwords, No.18

[6]. al-Futūḥ, vol.II, pp.418-419

Further, Mu'āwiya spoke about Imām's enmity to 'Uthmān and the fact that he was killed in his house and he remained quiet.

Mu'āwiya also said that, "If 'Alī wanted to stop 'Uthmān's murder, he could do it, but he did not. Now if 'Alī tells he truth, he can leave 'Uthmān's murderers to me for allegiance."

In his response, 'Alī (a) by referring to the victory God bestowed on the Prophet (s) and that He suppressed his enemies, mentioned that, "The people who mostly insisted on provocation against him were his family." Imām further said that they, Ahl al-Bayt, was the first people who believed the Prophet (s) while his tribesmen were up to kill their Prophets, wanted to uproot them and leave them in their hearts with sorrow and did the intemperate things to them. He also added that, "We were banned from having good food and drinking fresh clean water and granted us dismay. We were placed spies and guards, were forced to climb up unevenly impassable mount and were waged war. They put down a treaty not to eat, drink, marry and trade with us and never join hands with us, leaving us unsafe unless we hand them the Prophet (s) to be killed." By mentioning what pains he had taken in the wars in time of the Prophet (s), Imām further said, "You spoke of my envy of caliphs of my belated allegiance to them and of my rebellion against them. As for rebellion, I invoke by God if that could be true. Concerning my delayed approval of them as well as being displeased with what they did, I never apologize anybody for this."

Imām (a) continued to say his reason for his rightfulness of caliphate. He also talked about his no implication in murdering of 'Uthmān, citing Abū Sufyān's idea about Saqīfa event and that he asked Imām not to let Abū Bakr capture caliphate but to make him pay allegiance to him. "I refused, Imām added, to do so because people were almost close to days of infidelity and I strongly feared disunity among Muslims." [1]

This letter is a major proof of Imām's attitude towards caliphs and his idea about his rightful caliphate. After this, he wrote letters to Mu'āwiya and 'Amr Ibn 'Āṣ, trying to keep them away from the wrong way they were after.[2]

---

[1]. Waq'at Ṣiffīn, pp.86-91; Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.II, pp.277-282; Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, vol.15, p.73; al-Futūḥ, vol.II, pp.474-475; Nahdj al-sa'āda, vol.4, p.185

[2]. Waq'at Ṣiffīn, pp.110-111; al-Futūḥ, vol.II, pp.477-480

Imām (a) became determined to Djihād with Mu'āwiya. He repetitively recited this to himself, امرت بقتال الناكثين والقاسطين والمارقين[1] "Now, it is turn of the deviators, the apostates and the infidels to be launched a Djihād by Imām."

Imām called his outstanding companions of Muhādjirūn and Anṣār, asking them to express their idea about going to Damascus. Hāshim Ibn 'Utba, nephew of Sa'd Ibn Abī Waqqāṣ said that those people allegedly claim about revenge for 'Uthmān. They seek after this world and they must be suppressed as soon as possible.

'Ammār said that if they rushed one day earlier, it would be better. He composed,

سيروا إلى الأحزاب أعداء النبي سيروا فخير الناس أتباع علي[2]

"Move towards the parties and enemies of the Prophet because the best people are 'Alī's followers."

Qays Ibn Sa'd said, "Making Djihād with them is more obligatory than the one with the Turks and Romans.

Sahl Ibn Ḥunayf also declared Anṣār's readiness for joining and obeying Imām (a). Among the people there, one person objected and said, "You want to dispatch us to kill our Damascus brethren as you took us, yesterday, to kill our Baṣran brothers!" People began to crack him down. The man ran away and the people after him leading to his murder in public turbulence in Bāzār.[3]

Mālik Ashtar said, "You shouldn't be fretted with what this wretched traitor said. All people are your Shi'ite Muslims." [4]

Kūfa environment was, at this time, so good that no one dared disagree or even express dissent. Among the people, one who raised such and idea was Ḥanẓala Ibn Rabi'a. His tribesmen put him under so much pressure that he nightly fled and joined Mu'āwiya though he seemed not to have taken part in the war.[5]

However, even people who were fairly decent more or less remained in doubt. Abū Zubayb Ibn 'Awf asked Imām to officially testify that the way followed to cut off Wilāyat's link to Damascus troops and replaced with enmity to them is a true one. Imām attested that. After Imām (a), 'Ammār

---

[1]. al-Futūḥ, vol.II, p.460

[2]. Waq'at Ṣiffīn, p.101; al-Futūḥ, vol.II, p.460

[3]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.II, p.293; al-Futūḥ, vol.II, p.362; Akhbār al-ṭiwāl, p.164. Imām paid his blood money out of public property.

[4]. Waq'at Ṣiffīn, pp.92-96

[5]. Ibid. pp.98-99; al-Futūḥ, vol.II, p.444

attested that and he became assured of his way, relying on the two testimonies.[1]

Some people from companions of 'Abd Allāh Ibn Mas'ūd – once in charge of Kūfa's Bayt al-Māl – came to Imām and said, "We come with you but our division base will be independent. This is because we want to see who is after the credal error and embarks on rebellion."

Imām approved of their idea. One group of four hundred people led by Rabi'a Ibn Khuthaym, expressing doubt about the war, asked Imām to send them to one of the borderlines. Imām sent them to Riy borderline and Bāhila people who were displeased with Imām (a) and nor was Imām pleased with them were sent to Diylam frontier after he granted them their bounties.[2]

'Abd Allāh Ibn Badīl while in his speech confirming Imām's position said to Imām, "Their opposition to you is because of your previous strikes against them." He then said to people, "How should Mu'āwiya pay allegiance to 'Alī while his brother, Ḥanẓala, his uncle, Walīd and his grandfather, 'Utba are all killed in one war?" [3]

Ḥudjr Ibn 'Adī and 'Amr Ibn Ḥamiq marched and began to curse Damascus people. Imām summoned them and said that he did not like them to be known after curses. Instead, they could ask God to stop bloodshed and make peace.

'Amr Ibn Ḥamiq stressed over hid friendship with Imām and Imām prayed for him.[4] 'Amr stood on his pledge until he was martyred by Ibn Umm al-Ḥakam, Mu'āwiya's ruler in Djazīra.

Imām in a public sermon called all people to Djihād after he was assured of the fact that Mu'āwiya receives nothing but force and on the other hand, lords of Kūfa defend him in war with Damascus.

After him, Imām Ḥasan (a) began to speak, "God prepared for battling against your enemy, Mu'āwiya and his troops because he is already in state of alert. Leave not your spirit of campaign that, if abandoned, casts off bonds of hearts and that careering of sword and spear assures assistance and prevention of defeat."

After him, Imām Ḥusayn (a) induced people, in a speech, to fight with Damascus people. [5]

---

[1]. Waq'at Ṣiffīn, p.101

[2]. Ibid. p.115; Akhbār al-ṭiwāl, p.165, he seems to be the same Khādjih Rabi' whose tombstone, in Mashhad is visited very much.

[3]. Waq'at Ṣiffīn, p.102; al-Futūḥ, vol.II, p.447

[4]. Waq'at Ṣiffīn, p.103; al-Futūḥ, vol.II, p.448, Akhbār al-ṭiwāl, p.165

[5]. Waq'at Ṣiffīn, pp.114-115

Imām wrote to Ibn 'Abbās to ask for Baṣrans' help. Many Baṣrans, after being called by Imām, joined Ibn 'Abbās to Kūfa. Ibn 'Abbās put Abu l-Aswad Du'alī in his place in Baṣra. He wrote to Mikhnaf Ibn Sālim to put somebody in his place in Iṣfahān and join Imām and he did so.

At this time, Muḥammad Ibn Abī Bakr was ruler of Egypt on behalf of Imām. Writing a detailed letter to Mu'āwiya, he blamed Mu'āwiya for countering with Imām.

Muḥammad wrote as to Imām 'Alī's background,

"Now I see that you talk about being his counterpart while you're you and he's he who beats all with his unique record of all alms and virtues. He is from the people of the first man who has embraced Islam, more reliable in faith, more purified in family, having an honorable wife who stands higher than all people and he is of the best people to his cousin. Whilst you are damned of the cursed son. You and your father flamed seditions against religion of God and attempted to put out glow of Islam. You organized factions and parties, collected properties and for so doing, you held familiar company with anti-Islam tribes. Your father died after this way and you substituted him and the evidence is that the remaining groups, opposition parties, hypocrite leaders who have taken refuge in you are against the Prophet (s) and you have supported them. And the evidence for 'Alī, in addition to his public superiority and his Islamic initiative, is his companions of Muhādjirūn and Anṣār whose virtues are cited in Qur'ān and left in memories and God praised them .... Woe unto you! How do you parallel yourself to 'Alī whereas he is legatee of the Prophet (s) and his descendants and is the first man who obeyed him and stood up to his promise until his last days of life. The Messenger (s) kept him his confidant and his partner."

Replying him, Mu'āwiya wrote,

"To one who reproaches his father. Your letter is received ... You charged your father intemperately ... We and your father were together in the lifetime of the Prophet. We know that we have to respect the right of son of Abū Ṭālib and his supremacy over us is apparent, ... After the Prophet in that time, your father and his discriminator were the first people who disentitled 'Alī of his right and opposed him and they both unanimously allied with each other in this regard ... They never let him in their works and never revealed their secrets to him as long as they passed away... Therefore, if what we are up to is true, your father initiated it and if it is cruelty, your father again founded it. We are his partners and we followed his guidelines. In case your father had not covered this way before us, we would have never opposed son of Abū Ṭālib and would have surrendered ourselves. But we

observed what your father did and we too followed his foot-prints and modeled his manner." [1]

Kūfa poised for battle with Damascus. Imām ordered the warriors in Nukhayla, a military camp in Kūfa, to come together. Decorating pulpit of Kūfa with the bloody garment of 'Uthmān, while seventy thousand Shiykhs weeping around it, Mu'āwiya was made to prepare Damascus people for battling Iraqi troops.[2] Imām's uprising from Nukhayla happened on 5th of Shawwāl, 36 H.[3] The first dispute raised in Imām's troops was conflict over headmanship of Yemenī tribes. Imām (a) deposed Ash'ath and posed Ḥassān Ibn Makhdūdj. This spurred conflict between Kinda and Rabi'a. Upon hearing about this conflict, Mu'āwiya compelled one of Kinda poets to stimulate Ash'ath against Imām but he obtained no luck in that time and this was finished by placing him over the left wing of Iraqi troops.[4] Unfortunately, the enfeebled, spoiled and opportunist spirit of Ash'ath caused him to stand against Imām. It has been said that he had been writing letters to Mu'āwiya ever since Imām called him to Ādharbāydjān and ordered to have his properties appraised.[5] Ya'qūbī has mentioned his relationship with Mu'āwiya when Qur'āns were raised up.[6]

Imām (a) en route arrived in Ctesiphon and asked the citizens to join his troops. Behind Imām, eight hundred people along with Qays Ibn Sa'd and a short while later about four hundred people along with his son, Yazīd, joined Imām's troops. Imām on the way turned down all gifts of Iranian headmen and bewared them of welcoming emirs in such a way.[7] Upon request of his companions, Imām wrote another letter to Mu'āwiya and called him to Book of God, tradition of the Prophet (s) and prevention of bloodshed but Mu'āwiya poetically responded him that there rules sword between them.[8] On the way, Imām (a) demanded Raqqa 'Uthmānī – religion people[9] who were supporters of Mu'āwiya to install a bridge over the river for the troops to pass. Citizens refused to do so and they finally did it under the threat of

---

[1]. Waq'at Ṣiffīn, pp.118-121; Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.II, pp.393-397 and in the footnote of Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, vol.III, p.188; Murūdj al-dhahab, vol.III, p.10; Samṭ al-Nudjūm al-'Awālī, vol.II, p.465

[2]. Waq'at Ṣiffīn, p.127

[3]. Ibid. p.131

[4]. al-Futūḥ, vol.III, pp.105-107

[5]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.II, pp.296-297

[6]. Tārīkh al-ya'qūbī, vol.II, pp.188-189

[7]. Waq'at Ṣiffīn, vol.II, p.144; al-Futūḥ, vol.II, p.468

[8]. Waq'at Ṣiffīn, pp.150-151; Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.II, p.297

[9]. Tārīkh al-ya'qūbī, vol.II, p.187

Mālik. Imām kept three thousand people with Mālik until all the forces pass through. In the end, Mālik was the last one who crossed the bridge.[1] On passing through Iraq, when Imām reached Karbalā, he reported about the horrendous event that would happen to Ahl al-Bayt of the Prophet (s) in this land.[2]

In northern Iraq and Syria, front troops at Roman border, by passing through Hīt, Qirqīsiyā' and Raqqa faced front forces of Damascus led by Abu l-A'war Sulamī.

Imām sent Mālik forward to counter with them reaffirming to him that he, at any rate, should not initiate the war. Upon his arrival, Damascus troops launched fighting and the two sides were engaged in combat for some time. Afterwards, Damascus troops pulled back.

Concerning the time of Ṣiffīn war, there appear contradictory historical reports.

It seems that there exist two quotations. Balādhurī has cited Imām's arrival in Ṣiffīn to be on Dhi l-Ḥadjdja (36).[3] He reports the war from Dhi l-Ḥadjdja (in the year of 36), referring to fightings in this month and after in Ṣafar when major war took place.[4] Ya'qūbī says water dilemma goes to Dhi l-Ḥadjdja, 36 H. and that war in the year of 37 H. lasted forty days. However, he says arbitration goes to Ramaḍān, 38 H.[5] he means that the arbitration happened in Ṣafar, 37 H. about one and a half year after Ṣiffīn war! Based on this report, a treaty was put down in Ṣafar and as prescribed it will be brought to an end by Ramaḍān.

Ibn Athīr began events of Ṣiffīn from Dhi l-Ḥadjdja, 36 H. and ended in Ṣafar, 37 H., referring to arbitration within events of the same year.[6]

According to Khālīfa Ibn Khayyāṭ, Ṣiffīn war intensely lasted from 7th to 10th of Ṣafar, 37 H.[7] It seems war exceeded those days.

According to another report by Naṣr Ibn Muzāḥim, the first date specified is that when Imām (a) reached Ṣiffīn, he had correspondences with Damascus troops in the region of Ṣiffīn during months of Rabi'a al-Ākhir to Djamādī al-Thānī.[8] Following this, Ibn Muzāḥim mentions events of Radjab.

---

1. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.II, p.298; al-Futūḥ, vol.II, pp.487-488
2. al-Futūḥ, vol.II, pp.462-466; Waq'at Ṣiffīn, pp.140-142
3. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.II, p.299
4. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.II, p.303
5. Tarīkh al-ya'qūbī, vol.II, pp.188,190
6. al-Kāmil fī l-tārīkh, vol.III, pp.293,321
7. Tārīkh khalīfat Ibn khayyāṭ, p.191
8. Waq'at Ṣiffīn, p.190

This condition continued up to Dhi l-Ḥadjdja during which forces from the two sides fought with each other. After that in Muḥarram, hostilities came to a cessation and the main war was waged in Ṣafar.[1] Naturally, months of Rabi' al-Awwal and the two months of Djamādī can not be said to relate to the year of 36H. because Imām had arrived in Kūfa in Radjab of that year. As Naṣr said, Ṣiffīn war was launched from the second month of the year 37, lasting up to Ṣafar of next year. In this way, Ibn Muzāḥim's mention of dates exceed one year beyond those of Balādhurī's and some other historians. Dīnwarī's dates are exactly what Naṣr mentioned.[2] This is while Dīnwarī has set date of arbitration in Ṣafar of the year 37[3] despite his reference to Rabi'a al-Awwal and the two Djamādīs and it can not be true according to his previous settings. As his book's proofreader said, Muḥarram of the year 37 H. is the month when war stopped.[4] It is to be said that Ibn A'tham regards arrival of Imām's troops to be in Muḥarram of the year 38 H.[5] that seems untrue.

If this statement that Khāridjites selected 'Abd Allāh Ibn Wahb their leader in Zayd Ibn Ḥuṣayn's house in the late Shawwāl, 37 H. and that Imām 'Alī's war with them happened in Ṣafar of the year 38 H. is true[6], it is inevitably to be accepted that what Naṣr Ibn Muzāḥim said is not true. Overally, it is to be said that the majority agree on major fighting happening in Ṣafar of the year 37 H.

The region of fighting was in Ṣiffīn after which the war was known. Ṣiffīn is a cramped village of Roman villages that stands at a rifle – shut of the Euphrates. Alongside the Euphrates, there rest trees around which water surround and in the wilderness of two Farsangs (leagues) and there was no passing way except the Euphrates that is restricted and paved. [7]

When Iraqi troops approached Damascus troops, they noticed that they had stationed in the region having the paved route, passing through swamp, under their control. They had positioned bowmen and horsemen to prevent Iraqis from frequenting to the coast of the Euphrates.

Number of Damascus troops is said to be amounting to one hundred twenty thousand people.[8] Imām's troops moving out of Kūfa also numbered

---

1. Ibid. p.196
2. Akhbār al-ṭiwāl, pp.169-172
3. Ibid. p.196
4. Ibid. p.171
5. al-Futūḥ, vol.II, p.495
6. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.II, p.362
7. Akhbār al-ṭiwāl, p.168
8. al-Futūḥ, vol.II, p.439

eighty thousand people who were added by many of Ctesiphon people on the way.[1] Imām (a) sent Ṣa'ṣa'a to Mu'āwiya to tell him that his troops launched the war whereas Imām was up to talk to him again make an ultimatum.

"Now, Ṣa'ṣa'a said, you have barred us from water and Iraqi troops can not remain silent, with all this, Imām doesn't want to launch the war."

Mu'āwiya rejected what Ṣa'ṣa'a said. 'Amr Ibn 'Āṣ opposed Mu'āwiya's decision. He spoke about 'Alī's valor and also said that, "You – that is Mu'āwiya – and I have heard 'Alī when Fāṭima's house was inspected saying if he had forty men ...[2]."

But Mu'āwiya could not admit that and fighting began. The story of banning the water, on one hand linked to that of the water not reaching 'Uthmān[3] and on the other hand it was associated with the event of Karbalā.

Iraqi troops dominated the water through fighting with the courage of Mālik[4] and Imām ordered the troops not to ban Damascus forces from using water. By breaking out a news (through a spear on which there was a letter sent to Imām's troops but the sender was anonymous, perhaps it was from a friend!) that Imām controlled region will be enundated, Mu'āwiya displaced Iraqi troops. Imām who opposed the displacement of troops yielded to Iraqi's decision and Iraqi troops could only control the water after re-fighting. What Ibn A'tham said about these events slightly differ from Naṣr's report.[5] In all these events, Mālik played a pirotal role and strongly treated the Damascus troops.[6] Large numbers of forces had been killed in the fighting about which Naṣr has given an account in the form of boastful speeches and wars. A number of Qur'ān reciters from Iraq and Damascus mediated between the two armies, trying to resolve the dispute through talks. These mediatory attempts continued for a long time.

As referred, with Dhi l-Ḥadjdja coming to an end, Muḥarram came and war was supposed to come to a cessation.[7] Negotiations of Imām's envoys with Mu'āwiya came to a deadlock. Murdering of people such as 'Ammār, 'Adī Ibn Ḥātim, Mālik and those who, according to him, had a hand in murder of 'Uthmān, was set by him as his condition. This was something

---

[1]. Akhbār al-ṭiwāl, pp.166-167

[2].Waq'at Ṣiffīn, p.163

[3]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.II, p.298; al-Futūḥ, vol.III, p.2

[4]. al-Futūḥ, vol.III, p.13

[5]. Ibid. vol.III, p.15

[6]. Naṣr Ibn Muzāḥim says, وكان اكثر القوم حروباً الاشتر

Waq'at Ṣiffīn, p.195

[7]. Waq'at Ṣiffīn, p.196

unacceptable both by Imām and by Iraqi tribes. Imām (a) once in front of Abū Muslim Khawlānī asked murderers of 'Uthmān to be prepared. In that time, mosque became filled with crowds saying that they are murderers of 'Uthmān.[1] In Ṣiffīn, the same thing happened and about twenty thousand people of Iraqi troops stood away and said that they were 'Uthmān's killers.[2] Mu'āwiya's insistence on this condition was because he knew they would never accept that. He attempted to deceive those who had come as representatives and had been apt to be deceived. He said to Ziyād Ibn Ḥafṣa, "I want you to join us with your family and I make a pledge, after victory, to dispose you with each one of the two cities you want."

Ziyād said, "I have an axiom from my God for what He betowed me and I want not to be patron of wrongdoers." [3]

With the elapse of Muḥarram, month of illegals came to an end and Ṣiffīn war was launched between Mālik and Ḥabīb Ibn Muslim in the first day of Ṣafar, that as said, had been Wednesday! [4] In the night of war being launched, Imām advised all his forces, لا تقاتلوا القوم حتى يبدءوكم [5] "Avoid fighting these people until they launch the fighting."

Imām (a) here intended to leave a chance for return of Damascus troops to truth. Imām advised his troops this way, "If they did not initiate war, you don't fight them because you have full proof as to praise of God and as you leave them to launch the war, this is another proof for you and against them. If you fought and defeated the enemy, do not kill any fugitive and wounded, keep the pudenda veiled and do not mutilate any killed. In case you rushed into enemy camp, disgrace not anybody and enter not any house unless under my order. Take not away any of their property save what exists in the division camp. No woman has to be harmed although your honor is abused and your commanders and good relatives are charged with abuse because those women are weak in respect of soul and wisdom. We had the duty (in time of the Prophet Īs») not to harm them when they were pagan."[6]

However, war began on Ṣafar 1st [7], and the two sides intensely fought with each other. It seemed that each day one of Imām's commanders led the

---

[1]. Akhbār al-ṭiwāl, p.163

[2]. Ibid. p.170

[3]. Waq'at Ṣiffīn, p.199

[4]. Ibid. p.214; Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.II, p.303

[5]. al-Futūḥ, vol.III, pp.44-45

[6]. Waq'at Ṣiffīn, pp.203-204

[7]. Despite mention of the date in several sources, 12th of Ṣafar is regarded by Balādhurī (Ansāb, vol.II, p.323) to be on Friday that is inconsistent with this date. But regarding

frontline. Mālik on first day, Hāshim Ibn 'Utba on second day, 'Ammār Yāsir on third day, Muḥammad Ḥanafiyya on fourth day and 'Abd Allāh Ibn 'Abbās on fifth day commanded the frontline.[1] War escalated in the next Thursday and the left wing of Iraqi army split apart but it was compensated with bravery of Imām himself.[2] Imām himself was present among the troops and regularly called them to resistance by praying and preaching.[3] Naṣr Ibn Muzāḥim carefully formulated most of his invocations and speeches and portrayed two-peopled war scenes as far as possible.

Qays Ibn Sa'd, each day, spoke for Anṣār and incited them against Damascus people[4], emphasizing that companions of the Messenger (s) are with them. Seventy people, he said, of those in Badr stay with us and our commander is cousin of the Prophet (s), "a trustworthy person of Badr."[5]

Ya'qūbī has put that seventy people of Badrīs, seven hundred people of Riḍwān allegiance – prayers as well as four hundred people of Muhādjir and Anṣār stayed with Imām 'Alī (a). From Anṣār, there stayed nobody with Mu'āwiya except Nu'mān Ibn Bashīr and Maslama Ibn Mukhallad.[6] Just as Imām once brought Anṣār together, moving towards Damascus troops, so Mu'āwiya readied those two people and moved ahead.[7]

'Ammār Yāsir was among the people who directly talked against Mu'āwiya.

In response to some one who asked him how he would fight these Muslims while the Prophet (s) said, "I have a duty to fight as long as they declare monotheism, then their life and property is secure." 'Ammār said, "This is true, but these people have not embraced Islam. They inwardly rendered blasphemy until they found helpers today."[8] In another speech in Ṣiffīn, he rightly stressed over the point that these people deceitfully posed blood of 'Uthmān, yet their aim is, ليكونوا بذ لك جبابرة وملوكا[9] "He may become a tyrant by doing this."

---

the report by Naṣr about the citation of arbitration agreement of Wednesday 17th of Ṣafar, Balādhurī's reference to Friday 12th of Ṣafar is approved.

1. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.II, pp.303-305

2. Ibid. vol.II, pp.305-306

3. Waq'at Ṣiffīn, pp.230-232

4. Waq'at Ṣiffīn, p.447

5. Ibid. p.236; Ashtar in his speech said that roughly one hundred people from Badr stay with us. Waq'at Ṣiffīn, p.238

6. Tārīkh al-ya'qūbī, vol.II, p.188

7. al-Futūḥ, vol.III, pp.180-181

8. Waq'at Ṣiffīn, p.215

9. Ibid. p.319

In Ṣiflīn, 'Ammār seemed to many a sign of distinguishing gospel truth from credal error. The Prophet (s) said about him, تقتلك الفئة الباغية[1] "You will be killed by an aggressive group."

This successive narration led some people to see in what front 'Ammār stands and is martyred.

'Amr Ibn 'Āṣ himself had narrated this hadith. Mu'āwiya objected why he had narrated that. 'Amr composed a piece of poetry saying, "I didn't know this would happen in Ṣiffīn."[2]

This made a problem for Damascus troops as 'Amr was supposed to arrange a face-to-face debate with 'Ammār at the presence of a number of people from the two sides. 'Ammār said to 'Amr who, in the very beginning, made a profession of faith (Tashahhud), "You had abandoned this from time of the Prophet (s) and on."

'Amr who in deceit was saying, "What are we fighting for?"

Was told by 'Ammār, "You are the most obeyed among the troops. Do something to stop bloodshed."

He said, "Now I tell why I am fighting you.The Prophet (s) ordered me to fight with the infidels as well as with the deviators who are the very you, as for the apostates "Khāridjites" .... I wonder if I have to consider them or not.O You who are devoid of good qualities! Do you know not that the Messenger (s) said for 'Alī (a), من كنت مولاه فهذا عليّ مولاه ، اللّهم وال من والاه وعاد من عاداه "I love God, his Messenger (s) and after him 'Alī." 'Ammār continued to talk about 'Uthmān, "He opened to you gates of evils." 'Amr asked, "Did 'Alī kill him?" 'Ammār said, "No, but God of 'Alī killed him." He said, "Were you among the murderers?" 'Ammār replied, "I helped those who killed him and this day I fight with enemy helping them."[3] 'Amr Ibn 'Āṣ said to accompanying Damascus troops, "He confesses to murder of 'Uthmān." 'Ammār was martyred in one of the days of intense fighting. Several people of Damascus troops claimed responsibility for his murder.[4] It is also said that some Damascus people said prayers over his stiff ![5]

To Mu'āwiya, murder of 'Ammār Yāsir was "conquering the conquests."[6]

---

[1]. Concerning the sources, Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.II, pp.312-313 (footnote) in the following pages 'Amr Ibn 'Āṣ is quoted to have said the afore-mentioned hadith.

[2]. al-Futūḥ, vol.III, p.131

[3]. Waq'at Ṣiffīn, p.239; al-Futūḥ, vol.III, pp.124-125

[4]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.II, p.311-313

[5]. Mukhtaṣar Tārīkh Dimashq, vol.5, p.236

[6]. al-Muḥabbar, p.296

'Ammār composed about war with Damascus troops in a poetic line, religious justification of which is said to be interesting,

نحن ضربناكم على تنـــزيله فاليوم نضربكم على تأويله[1]

"Earlier, We beat thee for his descension and now we beat thee for his interpretation."

It meant although Damascus people have embraced Qur'ān and Islam, they really never confessed to it. Muslims also made use of sense of "rebellion".

Mughīra Ibn Ḥārith Ibn 'Abd al-Muṭṭalib said in a poem,

أهل الصلاة قتلناهم ببغيهم والمشركون قتلناهم بما جحدوا [2]

"Prayer-holders are killed for their rebellion and the atheists are murdered for their denial."

In the midst of fighting, Imām handed a Qur'ān to one of his troops to go to Damascus troops and call them to Qur'ānic arbitration, but they killed him.[3] Imām's troops superiority was utterly apparent. Once, 'Abd Allāh Ibn Badīl neared Mu'āwiya's settlement and made him retreat. Another time, 'Utba Ibn Abī Sufyān suffered so much a defeat that he took aback as far as twenty leagues.[4]

Of course, in some cases, left or right wing of Iraqi army temporarily disintegrated. Reports say that Imām himself fought and killed different people, one of whom was Ḥurayth, Mu'āwiya's Mawālī and a very strong man. He himself defied Imām and in the very beginning was sworded killed by Imām.[5] 'Urwa Dimashqī asked Imām for a challenge and was split in halves by Imām.[6] Another report says that Imām had trace of three strikes on his head and two on his face.

Naṣr Ibn Muzāḥim reporting this says that Imām (a) was never wounded.[7] Imām asked Mu'āwiya for a combat. Whoever wins the battle, he shall assume power. Mu'āwiya turned down his request.[8] Imām once faced 'Amr but he could run away the battle by unveiling his genitals because

---

[1]. Waq'at Ṣiffīn, p.340; Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.II, p.310

[2]. al-Futūḥ, vol.III, p.271

[3]. Waq'at Ṣiffīn, p.244

[4]. Waq'at Ṣiffīn, p.360

[5]. al-Futūḥ, vol.II, p.41; Akhbār al-ṭiwāl, p.176

[6]. al-Futūḥ, vol.III, p.187

[7]. Waq'at Ṣiffīn, p.363

[8]. Ibid. p.274; Akhbār al-ṭiwāl, p.176

Imām was very ashamed of what he did.[1] The same thing happened to Busr Ibn Arṭāt.[2]

Fighting was so intense that these days only in one battle over five hundred people (Ibn A'tham, One thousand) confronted with the same number of Damascus troops and none survived the battle![3]

Ṣiffīn war was tribally formed. Many tribes half of whom in Iraq and another half in Damascus stood against each other. Rabi'a[4] and Hamdān tribes, headman of the latter of which was Sa'īd Ibn Qays sacrificed in the most part in as much as Imām said in a piece of poetry,

فلو كنت بوّاباً على باب جنة لقلت لهمدان ادخلوا بسلام [5]

"If I were gate keeper of Heaven, I would tell Banū Hamdān people to enter there in goodness."

Imām said about Rabi'a as well, وكان علي (ع) لا يعدل بربيعة أحداً من شدة محبته لهم "'Alī never equaled Banū Rabi'a to anyone for his love extended to them."[6]

Mu'āwiya advised Damascus troops to aim at no people but Hamdānīs since they stand as 'Uthmān's adversary.[7] The truth is that Mu'āwiya feared them and he was at weakening them. 'Ubayd Allāh Ibn 'Umar, one of Damascus troops commanders, was murdered by one of Hamdānīs in one of these battles. Dhi l-Kilā', one of the greatest commanders of Damascus troops, was killed in Ṣiffīn. He is said to have heard through 'Amr Ibn 'Āṣ, in time of 'Umar, (seemingly through a person named Abū Nūḥ who quoted this to him from 'Amr Ibn 'Āṣ in Ṣiffīn)[8] the Prophet (s) saying that 'Ammār is killed by an aggressive tribe, so he used to fight while being in doubt. Mu'āwiya liked very much to kill him fearing that he might be a trouble for Damascus troops. In contrast, a good many of marked troops of Imām (a) were also martyred. One of Ṣiffīn martyrs, Uwiys Qaranī[9], is the noted Gnostic who was and, still is, highly ranked among Muslims. Ibn A'tham

---

1. Waq'at Ṣiffīn, p.407; Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.II, p.330; Akhbār al-ṭiwāl, p.177

2. al-Futūḥ, vol.III, pp.173-174

3. Waq'at Ṣiffīn, p.293; al-Futūḥ, vol.III, p.55

4. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.II, p.325; Akhbār al-ṭiwāl, p.186

5. Waq'at Ṣiffīn, p.437; Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.II, p.322; al-Futūḥ, vol.III, pp. 43 – 44

6. al-Futūḥ, vol.III, p.163

7. al-Futūḥ, vol.III, p.163

8. al-Futūḥ, vol.III, pp.119-120

9. Waq'at Ṣiffīn, p.324; Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.II, p.320. Balādhurī hesitates to report about martyrdom of Uwiys. The proof reader mentions on pages 320-322 various sources in which this undeniable report is referred.

while reporting his martyrdom in Ṣiffīn made an account of him.[1] Hāshim Ibn 'Utba, known as Hāshim al-Mirqāl, who had lost one eye in conquests, was the most devoted companions of Imām being martyred in Ṣiffīn. He was Sa'd Waqqāṣ's nephew and unlike his position of being among Qā'idīn stayed with Imām with complete assurance until he was martyred.[2]

Khuzayma, another companion of Imām, was also martyred in Ṣiffīn and Imām approved his one testimony as two, for which he was known after "Dhū al-Shahādatayn" meaning two witnesses.

After their martyrdom, there were still seen famous people in troops, like Ashtar (who was nicknamed by Mu'āwiya as lion of army)[3], 'Adī Ibn Ḥātim and Qays Ibn Sa'd.

It is to be noted that a number of Kūfiyān women also attended Ṣiffīn war, exhorting Iraqi forces against those of Damascus by making poems in which Imām was praised and his virtues were retold. Among them, there were Sūda, daughter of 'Umāra Hamdānī, Umm Sanān[4], Zarqā', daughter of 'Adī Hamdānī[5] and others whose biographies are mentioned in various sources.

Umm Sanān addressed 'Alī in Ṣiffīn and said,

قد كنت بعد محمد خلفاً لنا أوصى اليك بنا وكنت وفيّا [6]

"After Muḥammad(s), he was his successor among us and he kept his promise well in front of us."

One of these women named Umm al-Khayr said in Ṣiffīn, إنما إحن بدريّة وضغائن جاهلية وأحقاد احديّة، وثب معاوية عند الغفلة ليدرك بها الفرصة من ثارات عبد شمس [7] "Mu'āwiya's waging war comes from his vengeance in Badr, Uḥud and from his ignorant bigotry and it is because he wants to take revenge for 'Abd-e Shams."

Another woman was Djurwa, daughter of Murra Ibn Ghālib Tamīmī who was later brought by Mu'āwiya to Damascus. When she was asked by Mu'āwiya about Imām 'Alī (a), she said, حاز والله الشرف حتى لا يوصف ، وغاية حتى لا تعرف[8], "By God, he attained an indescribable nobility and reached a station beyond imagination."

---

[1]. al-Futūḥ, vol.II, pp.451-460

[2]. He is reported in detail in Waq'at Ṣiffīn including, pp.346-356

[3]. al-Futūḥ, vol.II, p.67

[4]. Ibid. vol.II, p.101

[5]. Ibid. vol.III, p.142

[6]. al-Futūḥ, vol.III, p.103

[7] al-Wāfidāt min l-nisā' 'alā Mu'āwīya, p.29

[8] Ibid. p.36

Mu'āwiya tried to break apart Iraqi army in ways except war. Writing different letters to Abū Ayyūb Anṣārī, 'Abd Allāh Ibn 'Abbās and others under the pretext of stopping bloodshed and even of promising caliphate to Ibn 'Abbās[1], he attempted to force them to oppose Imām (a). Besides, he changed the condition by frequently granting money to his troops, لم يبق من أهل العراق أحد فى قلبه مرض إلاّ طمع فى معاوية "There remained no one but the problematic Iraqis who joined Mu'āwiya in his caprice and this was such that Imām was bothered."[2]

Mu'āwiya also wrote to Imām asking him to leave Damascus to him without wanting to obey him. This was the same thing he had demanded before and as mentioned, he intended to establish an independent emirate in Damascus. Imām turned him down.[3] This time, Damascus people strongly spoke about severe bloodshed and publicized their aim of ending the war. Such a measure was taken just to hinder Damascus conquest, and probably to bring about a gap and discard in Iraq's army. This was what Mu'āwiya failed to do repeatedly; yet as we shall wee later, he finally made it. In one of these days, one of the Damascus people came between the two armies and proposed that Iraq any return to Iraq and Damascus army to Damascus, so to avert a bloodshed.

Confirming his truthfulness, Imām said, "I know that you made this proposal out of benevolence and pity; however, I have considered well, contemplated carefully and assessed the dimensions of this deed haunting me, and I have found no way but submitting to was, or refuting what Allāh has inspired the Prophet(s). Indeed, Allāh, the blessed and exalted, doesn't like His friends to remain reticent and submit while tyranny and mutiny are prevailing on the earth, and not to enjoin the good and forbid from the evil. That's why I realized that to me, the war (with all its hardship) is easier than enduring the hell with its chains."[4]

In one of the last war days, the battle became so intense that it started by the morning prayer and continued up to the mid-night. During all this period, Ashtar was busy provoking the army. This night was called "Laylā al-Ḥarīr", the night of clamor. Again the war started from the middle of that night and continued up to the noon of the next day.

"The enemy fought to its last grasp", said Imām, in a sermon.

Mu'āwiya and 'Amr thinking that everything was finished and feeling that they cannot be so hopeful of Damascus army, embarked on a trick. The

---

[1] Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.II, p.307

[2] Waq'at Ṣiffīn, p.435; al-Futūḥ, vol.III, pp.221-222

[3] Waq'at Ṣiffīn, pp.470-471

[4]. Ibid, p. 474; al-Futūḥ, vol.III, pp.264-65

next day after the night of clamor, when the war lasted to the moon of that day,[1] 500 Qur'āns were raised above the spears of the Damascus people.

There were loud voices crying, "O group of Arabs! Think of your women and girls. If you'll be killed, who will stand up to Romans, Turks and Persians tomorrow?" [2]

As a result of this measure, little by little, this proclamation was heard within the Iraqi army that the enemy has admitted the arbitration of Qur'ān, and we don't have the right to fight them. Imām defined this remarks strongly and announced that this deed is nothing but a trick. Ṣa'ṣa'a said that Mu'āwiya took this measure after he heard Ash'ath Ibn Qays reminding of the women and girls at the night of clamor, and that Arabs are collapsing.[3] Besides, Ash'ath was the first person opposing Imām on the continuation of the war. We've previously pointed out that the account of his correspondence with Mu'āwiya, since his dismissal from Adharbāydjān has been mentioned in historical records. Here, Ya'qūbī as well clarified that Mu'āwiya conciliating Ash'ath wrote to him and invited him there.[4] Ash'ath's measure was supported by the Yemenī.[5]

The minimum problem concerning Ash'ath was that he was apt to deviation from the outset, and was drawn to this path. In the thick of the clashes, we have in hand some of his remarks against Mu'āwiya and with respect to instigating Iraq army.[6] It ought to be known that tribal obstinacy played a crucial role and in all likelihood, Imām's true heed to Mālik caused Ash'ath to take umbrage.

The escalation of the discrepancy amongst the army of Imām, has induced much more hardships for him. Imām felt that he is no more the commander, and the people have tied his hands, and turned out to be his emir.

Even so, Imām stood up and said, "I deserve to admit the arbitration of Allāh's book more than the others; however, Mu'āwiya and his companions are not the companions of religion and Qur'ān. I know them better than you. I was with them since my childhood."

At this moment, about 20000 of the Iraq army came to Imām, and without calling him "Amīr al-Mu'minīn", asked him to accept the arbitration of Qur'ān. Among these people were a group of Qur'ān-reciters being

---

[1]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.II, p.323

[2]. Waq'at Ṣiffīn, p.478

[3]. Ibid, p.481

[4]. Tarīkh al-ya'qūbī, vol.II, pp.188-89

[5]. Ibid, vol.II, p.189

[6]. al-Futūḥ, vol.II, p.74

contented with Qur'ān recitation, and a number of whom joining the Khāridjites's range.[1] At this time, Ashtar at the front line approached Mu'āwiya division camp while fighting. War dissenters asked Imām to order Ashtar back. Imām sent Yazīd Ibn Hānī for him.

Ashtar sent a message that, "Now it is not the time for a return."

"You've prompted him to fight, if Ashtar doesn't return, we'll kill you." Said the dissenters.

As a result of this statement, Ashtar returned and he was stopped. In a letter to Mu'āwiya, Imām noting that we know you're not the follower of Qur'ān, pointed out the acceptance of Qur'ān arbitration.[2] Ash'ath went to Mu'āwiya asking him regarding the way of executing Qur'ān precept. He said that it's better that one of our people and one of yours sit together and express their opinion concerning Qur'ān precept in this regard. He forwarded this opinion to Imām. Afterwards, a group of Damascus and Iraq Qur'ān-reciters came between the two armies and recited Qur'ān for some time and agreed to revive what the Qur'ān has revived. Thereafter, Damascus people appointed 'Amr Ibn 'Āṣ. Ash'ath and a number of those joining the Khāridjites later, proposed Abū Mūsā Ash'arī. Imām refused him on account of his opposition to him in Djamal battle, but they insisted in this regard. Imām's proposal was either Ibn 'Abbās or Ashtar, but they said that Ashtar believes in war, Ibn 'Abbās shouldn't be either, for 'Amr Ibn 'Āṣ is from Mudhar tribe, so the other side should be Yemenī. لا والله لايحكم فيها مضريان حتى تقوم الساعة[3] "By Allāh, two persons from Mudrids won't judge in that until the Day of Resurrection."

Imām saw that insistence is out of place and said, "Do whatever you want."[4]

Later on Ibn 'Abbās said, "Had at that time some companions been patient, the victory would have been imminent."[5]

So it was agreed that a convention will be written. In this convention pointing to the appointment of these two persons by Damascus and Iraq people, it was mentioned that these two persons are due to comment on the matter of their disagreement, "Provided that these two abide by the divine covenant and pledge in the firmest and greatest manner which Allāh has extracted promise from each of his creatures. And that during the duty on which they were dispatched, they put Qur'ān before themselves, and do not

---

[1]. Waq'at Ṣiffīn

[2]. Ibid, pp.490-494

[3]. Regrettably Mudrī and Yemenī competition induced problem at Ṣiffīn battle.

[4]. Waq'at Ṣiffīn, pp.499-500

[5]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.II, p.331

exceed, I their judgment, what has been written in the Qur'ān, and if they don't find, they will act on the basis of the comprehensive Sunna of the Prophet (s), and they should in no way, act in conformity with their desires, neither should they be entangled in suspicion." Besides, it was agreed that in case of the death of one of these two, before judgment, the commander of the aforesaid side would be able to appoint somebody else. During this span of time, if one of the two commanders passed away, the people of that area will appoint another just person instead of him. Further, it was stated that, "it is compulsory for the judges to adhere to the divine treaty and pledge and not to offer an interpretative judgment of their own in opposition to the Qur'ānic text, and not to oppress deliberately and not to be entangled in suspicion and not to overlook the order of Qur'ān and Sunna of the Prophet(s) in their judgment. And if they don't do so, the people won't submit to their judgment, neither will they admit the treaty and the liability approved by those two." In the convention, the date of the arbitration was sset on the end of the next Ramaḍān (to wit eight months from Ṣafar to Ramaḍān) and it was agreed that the issue will be resolves anyhow up to the pilgrimage season. "If they don't judge on the basis of the Qur'ān and Prophet's (s) Sunna till the end of the season, the Muslims will remain at war as they were from the onset, and there is no condition between the two groups in this regard." The aforesaid treaty was concluded on Wednesday (according th Abū Mikhnaf, on Friday)[1], on Ṣafar 17, 37 A.H.[2]

In this convention, equal rights were been determined for Imām and Mu'āwiya. In the first stage, Imām's name was accompanied by the title "Amīr al-Mu'minīn", the Commander of the Faithful, but it was not acceptable for Mu'āwiya.

Ash'ath insisted on the elimination of this title, Imām said, "Glory be to Allāh, A Sunna like The Prophet's (s) one, where Suhayl Ibn 'Amr, the representative of polytheists, insisted on the ommition of "Rasūl Allāh", the Messenger of Allāh, in Ḥudaybiyyah peace pact."[3]

Anyhow, the convention was written, but among a group of Imām's companion, a riot broke out which paved the way for Khāridjites incidents later. Some disagreed with the convention there except for those being truly among the Shi'ite Muslims of Imām, and bearing the arbitration course for Imām's sake.

Mālik was among them, when Imām (a) was told that Mālik is not satisfied with this convention, Imām (a) said, "When I will be satisfied,

---

[1]. Ibid, vol.II, p.337; see, p.338

[2]. Akhbār al-ṭiwāl, pp.194-196, Waq'at Ṣiffīn, pp.504-570, see, Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.II, pp.334-335

[3]. Waq'at Ṣiffīn, p.508; Tārīkh al-ya'qūbī, vol.II, p.189

Mālik will be so as well, and I'm satisfied. You said he has kept himself aloof from me, but I don't reckon that he'll do so. There are not two persons or even one person amongst you like him, who think so about their foe."[1]

Imām returned to Kūfa along with the army on Rabi' al-Awwal 37 A.H.[2] In Kūfa, loud voices of cries and weeps were heard from each house, and Imām confirming the martyrdom of their martyrs, offered his condolence to them. Finally, Imām sent Abū Mūsā to the arbitration site.

Imām dispatched 400 persons along with Abū Mūsā Ash'arī, accompanied by Shurayḥ Ibn Hānī as their commander, and 'Abd Allāh Ibn 'Abbās as their congregational prayer leader. Additionally, Imām notified Abū Mūsā of the defiled nature of Mu'āwiya and advised him tremendously.[3] At this time, 'Abd Allāh Ibn 'Umar, Mughīra Ibn Shu'ba, 'Abd Allāh Ibn Zubayr had to come to Mu'āwiya and were present at the meeting incident of 'Amr Ibn 'Āṣ and Abū Mūsā.[4] 'Amr Ibn 'Āṣ, when meeting Abū Mūsā, spoke of the virtues! of Mu'āwiya and noted that Mu'āwiya is the blood-wit of 'Uthmān, and Allāh has put a "Sultan" for blood-wit. Abū Mūsā relied on the revival of 'Umar tradition concerning the issue of council. Once he spoke of 'Abd Allāh Ibn 'Umar, but 'Amr said that a weak person like him could not take the responsibility of such a deed. It was not only unclear under which principles this council being regarded as a pretext by the dissenters, ought to be shaped, but not obvious who should be the member of such a council. Once 'Umar relying on his own power has placed caliphate among six persons so that they will choose one out of them. What was the connection of this matter to leaving the work to the "Council among Muslims", so to select one for themselves? Abū Mūsā insisted on this matter and an account of that he was of the belief that firstly we ought to leave this belief aside that one of the two persons either Imām or Mu'āwiya should be the caliph, so that thereupon we shall select some one. Hence, for Abū Mūsā's part, the declaration of these two commands' deposition of Imām's commentary on the pulpit, 'Amr Ibn 'Āṣ announced that he has just the right to depose 'Alī (a); however, I have the caliphate to Mu'āwiya! Abū Mūsā cried out in protest and insulted 'Amr Ibn 'Āṣ. Abū Mūsā called 'Amr a dog, and 'Amr called Abū Mūsā a donkey and the session turned out in chaos. So hereby, without speaking of the Qur'ān and the Sunna of the

---

[1]. Waq'at Ṣiffīn, p.521; see, Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.II, p.236

[2]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.II, p.237

[3]. Nathr al-durr, vol.I, p.421

[4]. Waq'at Ṣiffīn, pp.540-541

Prophet (s), and merely under the pretext of 'Umar tradition, the arbitration course itself gave rise to another disagreement between Damascus and Iraq.[1]

From that time on, the people of Damascus called Mu'āwiya "Amīr al-Mu'minīn", and this was the most significant outcome of the arbitration for the Damascus people. Abū Mikhnaf stated that when Iraqi people were going to Ṣiffīn, they were all amiable and kind towards each other. When they returned, however, they all had hostility and hatred towards each other.

The Khāridjites said, "You were flaccid in implementing Allāh's order", and another group told them, "You disobeyed Imām and our group." Imām became sorrowful on account of their remarks.[2]

WAR WITH EXTREMIST KHĀRIDJITES

Exactly when Ash'ath Ibn Qays read the arbitration convention for various groups of the army, a group of the army cried out in front of him, لا حكم الا لله "The only judgment is that of Allāh's."[3]

According to Naṣr Ibn Muzāḥim, some people from Banū Murād, Banū Rāsib, and Banū Tamīm chanting aloud, and expressing their disgust concerning the arbitration of men said, "Just Allāh merits arbitration."

Among the dissenters, 'Amr Ibn Udayya (and in another narration 'Urwa Ibn Djudayr)[4] attacked Ash'ath. His sword was quietly dropped on Ash'ath's horse. Shortly after the coming of Ash'ath to Imām and his declaring that all but few of the people were satisfied, the shouts of "the only judgment is that of Allāh" grew louder. Their question was, "What about our murdered persons?" Allāh has settled Mu'āwiya's work, and Allāh's order is nothing but suppressing Damascus army. It is obvious that in front of some people like Ash'ath, many people of Iraqi army were not ready to submit themselves to Damascus people whatever reason there might be when one group won't do so? They asked Imām to forsake the issue of arbitration, and in principle, to report of his former opinion which has led to polytheism. Imām by referring to the verse, اوفوا بالعقود "Fulfill the obligations," said that now the agreement has been reached and we have no remedy but patience up to the end of the duration of this convention.[5]

---

[1]. Waq'at Ṣiffīn. pp.545-546; Akhbār al-ṭiwāl, pp.199-201; Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.II, pp.350-51

[2]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.II, p.342

[3]. Akhbār al-ṭiwāl, p.196

[4]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.II, p.339

[5]. Waq'at Ṣiffīn, pp.413-414; Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.II, p.351

Imām said to them, "As you see, most of this crowd are not in line with war, and if you wage war these people will be together than Damascus people towards you."[1]

In their way back to Ṣiffīn, the people were divided into two groups, a group protesting against the arbitration, and another group accusing them of being separated from the company.[2] Near to Kūfa, a group was little by little separated from the army and went to Ḥarūrā' area half a league away from Kūfa.[3] That's why later on these people were referred to as Ḥarūriyya.

The most outstanding persons of Khāridjites were as follows, Ḥurqūṣ Ibn Zuhayr Tamīmī, Shurayḥ Ibn Awfī al-'Absī, Farwa Ibn Nawfal Ashdja'ī, 'Abd Allāh Ibn Wahb Rāsibī. These people came to Imām, after his entering Kūfa, and asked him not to dispatch Abū Mūsā for the arbitration.

Imām said, "We have admitted something that we cannot violate."[4] As it seems from the names of these persons, no one amongst them was from the renowned people of Iraq. In contrast, they belonged typically to a nomadic tribes such as Bakr Ibn Wā'il and Banū Tamīm.[5] The Khāridjites, for the most part, were from nomads who, in principal, had no idea concerning Imamate and politics as being matters beyond tribal issue. They demonstrated this tendency of theirs within a framework out of a deviated interpretation from the slogan "the only judgment is that of Allāh". Amongst the Khāridjites was 'Itrīs Ibn 'Arqūb Shaybānī who was from the companions of 'Abd Allāh Ibn Mas'ūd.[6]

Khāridjites put forward some crucial issues. Their first question was that how Imām consented to the arbitration of "men" in the act of "religion". Their second question was that why Imām was contented to have his title of caliphate, to wit Amīr al-Mu'minīn, omitted. Their problem, as Ya'qūbī puts it, was that Imām spoilt his executorship through this measure.[7]

Their another question was that why Imām didn't give the permission of distributing booties after their triumph over the infidels. How is it that their killing was permissible, but taking their possessions was not lawful?[8]

---

1. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.II, pp.331-338
2. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.II, p.342
3. Tārīkh al-ya'qūbī, vol.II, p.191
4. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.II, p.359
5. Ibid, vol.II, p.350
6. Ibid, vol.II, p.363
7. Tārīkh al-ya'qūbī, vol.II, p.192
8. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.II, p.360

With respect to the omission of the title "Amīr al-Mu'minīn", Imām invoked the omission of the title "Rasūl Allāh", Allāh's Messenger, in the Ḥudaybiyya peace pact.

Besides, he said regarding arbitration, "I disagreed with this arbitration from the outset, later, as well, when I yielded to it on account of the people's compulsion, I stipulated that I will abide by their judgment provided that they judge on the basis of Allāh's book, inasmuch as we have originally admitted the arbitration of Qur'ān rather than that of men." Moreover, Imām announced his decision concerning the continuation of war against Damascus, after the collection of tribute. Thus hereby, many of those joining the Khāridjites, joined Imām's adherents' group.[1] Yet, there were a lot still sticking to their own beliefs. They disagreed with the arbitration by referring to the only judgment is that of Allāh. Sticking to appearances, and drawing hardline deductions through ضرب القرآن بعضه ببعض "He put Qur'ān aside," were considered among Khāridjites' peculiarities. Imām said in front of those chanting this slogan and protesting against him in the mosque, كلمة حق يراد بها الباطل "This is a truthful statement aimed at drawing an untruthful interpretation from it."

Imām encountering his foreign dissenters said that if they remained reticent, we would leave them on their own. If they propagated and spoke in return, we would speak with them and if they revolted against us, we would wage war against them. At this moment, one of the Khāridjites stood up and said, "O Allāh! We seek refuge with you from submitting to abjectness in your religion, this is a frailty and shall lead to Allāh's wrath."[2]

According to another narration, it's been pointed out that the continuation of Khāridjites protest lasting for six months after Imām's return from Ṣiffīn resulted in Imām's dispatch of 'Abd Allāh Ibn 'Abbās and Ṣa'ṣa'a Ibn Ṣūḥān to them for the purpose of discussion. They didn't submit to these two persons' request concerning their return to the group. Imām asked them to select 12 persons and he himself separated this number and held talks with them.

Initially, Imām spoke with them about the Qur'ān evidence with regard to arbitration and said, "I, 'Alī, despite disagreeing with their request, was fearful that they might invoke those verses concerning the admissibility of arbitration."[3]

---

[1]. Ibid, vol.II, p.349

[2]. Ibid, vol.II, p.352

[3]. The verses, Āl Imrān / 23; al-Mā'ida / 95; al-nisā' / 35

Khāridjites' orator stood up and said, "We fought side with you so far as you were confident of your action at Djamal and Ṣiffīn battle; however, at present you are dubious. You must repent and attest to the fact that you've been misled. In that case, we will be with you."

Imām said, "From the moment when I embraced Islam, I was not a bit doubtful about it. Allāh has basically guided you and rescued you from infidelity, through us. I had said that two judges ought to judge on the basis of Allāh's book. If they didn't do so, to me, their judgment will be of no value."[1] Their leader, Ibn al-Kawwā' detached himself from them along with 500 persons. Some have noted that he was with the Khāridjites in Nahrawān, and therein was involved in a wrangle with Imām.[2] Khāridjites' problem was that they regarded the acceptance of arbitration as infidelity, and therefore they asked Imām to witness his infidelity and repent of it,[3] not that he has merely committed a sin. Hence, Imām said in a poem,

يا شاهد الله عليّ فاشهد آمنت بالله ولي احمد

من شك في الله فاني مهتد

"O thou, Allāh's witness!

To me, thou be a witness!

I believed in Allāh, the Master of Aḥmad

Whoever doubts Allāh

I have been guided"[4]

Anyhow, the repeated remarks of Imām and his companions failed to bring a number of Khāridjites back from the path they've chosen. On Shawwāl, 31 A.H. the Khāridjites gathered at Zayd Ibn Ḥusayn's house and selecting 'Abd Allāh Ibn Wahb Rāsibī as their leader,[5] they resettled their political and military situation. This decision was made after Ramaḍān month in which Abū Mūsā was dispatched for arbitration. Following the arbitration, they didn't allow staying in Kūfa and decided to go to Madā'in. There from, they wrote to their Baṣrī co-thinkers inviting them to come round to them. Some of them didn't deem it advisable to go to Madā'in on account of the presence of Imām 'Alī's (a) Shi'ite Muslims and chose Nahrawān. After the announcement of arbitration result, Imām 'Alī (a)

---

[1]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.II, p.354

[2]. Akhbār al-ṭiwāl, p.209

[3]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.II, p.361

[4] Ibid, vol.II, pp.356-369

[5] Ibid, vol. II, p. 364.

declaring his opposition to the arbitration result, asked the people to congregate to the division camp for fighting the infidels.[1]

Imām sent for the Khāridjites and told them, "These two judges acted in opposition to the Qur'ān, and I'm leaving for Damascus. You accompany me as well."[2]

They said, "we are not allowed to appoint you as Imām." After the congregation of people in Nukhayla, Iraq moved to Anbār city and left there for Shāhī village, and therefore they went to Dabāhā and to Diminmā.[3]The Khāridjites gathering at Nahrawān by now, encountered 'Abd Allāh the son of Khabbāb Ibn Arat on their way. They asked 'Abd Allāh's opinion concerning Imām 'Alī (a).

He said, "Amīr al-Mu'minīn and Imām of the Muslims." They killed 'Abd Allāh along with his pregnant wife. It's been said that the Khāridjites, on their way, asked everybody encountered by them, about his opinion regarding arbitration. They killed him in case of not being in line with them.[4] This movement led Imām to decide to confront them.[5] The reason behind this matter was that Imām was not able to leave Kūfa alone with such criminals, while therein there were just the women and children. Imām went over to Madā'in and there from headed for Nahrawān. Imām, in a letter to Khāridjites invited them to return to the group. 'Abd Allāh Ibn Wahb, in the answer of Imām's letter, pointing to what has so far taken place, notified of the same former remarks concerning Imām's doubt in religion and the necessity of his repentance. Qays Ibn Sa'd and Abū Ayyūb Anṣārī were against them and asked them to join them for fighting Mu'āwiya. Khāridjites said that they don't admit the Imamate of the Imām. They will be ready to accompany them, only if their leadership will be in the hands of some like 'Umar.[6] As soon as Imām realized that these people are not submissive, he put his troops being 14000 in number, into array against Khāridjites. At this moment, Farwa Ibn Nawfal along with 500 persons of Khāridjites were separated from the Khāridjites and resided in Bandanīdjayn and Daskara.[7] Another number of them left gradually, to the extent that just 1800 cavalry

---

[1]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.II, p.366, and in its footnote from, al-Imāma wa l-siyāsa, vol.I, p.143

[2]. Akhbār al-ṭiwāl, p.206

[3]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.II, p.367

[4]. Akhbār al-ṭiwāl, p.206

[5]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.II, pp.362-368

[6]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.II, p.370; Akhbār al-ṭiwāl, p.207

[7]. Akhbār al-ṭiwāl, p.210

men and 1500 infantry men remained alongside 'Abd Allāh Ibn Wahb.[1] At this time, Imām also asked his companions not to initiate the war.[2] Khāridjites started the war. They were overthrown, and their leader was very swiftly killed.[3] Apart from the fugitives, four hundreds of those having been fallen in the battlefield were delivered to their families. This clash took place on Ṣafar 9, 38 A.H.[4]

When the war was terminated, Imām asked the people to head for Damascus to fight the infidels. The people, however, showed signs of fatigue, and the remarks of Ash'ath Ibn Qays led Imām to return to Nukhayla, the people went to Kūfa, and just 300 persons remained with the Imām.[5] Consequently, Imām returned to Kūfa. From that time on, Imām invited the people for Djihād, holy was, against the Damascus people once in a while, but no one gave a favorable answer. It was here where Imām in his long sermons, reproached Kūfa people and spoke repeatedly of their disloyalty up to the end.

Here another movement ought to be taken into account as well, a movement somewhat resembling that of Khāridjites. Khirrīt Ibn Rashīd, taking part in Ṣiffīn battle, in his way back to Kūfa, objected to Imām and said that he won't pray along with him anymore. His objection was similar to Khāridjites' remarks. He considered arbitration a mistake. At night, he left Kūfa together with his companions for Kaskar. Qaradha Ibn Ka'b, the governor of Sawād areas, wrote a letter to Imām reporting that an army from Kūfa has arrived this area and when encountering a person from the peasants of Euphrates areas namely Zādhān Farrukh, have asked him about his religion. He said that he is a Muslim. They asked his opinion concerning Amīr al-Mu'minīn (a). He replied he is the commander of the faithful and the successor of Allāh's Messenger(s). Hence, they cut him into pieces by their swords.[6] This measure of theirs was exactly the same as Khāridjites' when encountering 'Abd Allāh Ibn Khabbāb. Imām wrote to Ziyād Ibn Khaṣafa commissioning him to suppress Banū Nādjiya under the leadership

---

[1]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.II, p.371

[2]. Akhbār al-ṭiwāl, p.210

[3]. One of them is Yazīd Ibn Nuwayra Anṣāri whose being a heavenly man was witnessed twice by The Prophet(s) (al-Iṣāba, vol.II, p.348) The list of the martyrs of this war has been noted by Ibn A'tham (vol.IV, p.121) and Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd (vol.II, p.29). See their narrations with martyrs' names at Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.II, p.314, (footnote)

[4]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.II, pp.374-375. It's been noted in Futūh (vol.III, p.277) that when Imām ended his war with Khāridjites and went to Kūfa, 17 days were remained from Ramaḍān.

[5]. Ibid, vol.I, p.319

[6]. al-Ghārāt, vol.I, p.346

of Khirrīt Ibn Rashīd. Subsequent to the sever clash during which five companions of Khirrīt were killed and two persons of Imām's army were martyred,[1] the rebels headed towards Ahwāz. Therein some natives as well as some Kurds joined them. Imām was compelled to dispatch a separate force to suppress them. Ma'qil Ibn Qays Riyāḥī was selected for this commission, and he headed towards them along with some armies. When the rebels were moving towards Rāmhurmuz, Ma'qil, on his way reaches them and fought them. During this conflict, 70 persons from Banū Nādjiya and 300 of Kurds and the other natives accompanying him were killed. Khirrīt headed hurriedly towards the coast, and therein he was able to deceive a number of people from Banū 'Abd al-Qays.

Imām wrote a letter to the residents of that area calling them for "obedience". They scattered from around Khirrīt too. Once again, Ma'qil clashed with him, and this time Khirrīt and most of those along with him were killed.

According to Balādhurī, Khirrīt acted in such a way that the Khāridjites assumed that he is of their opinion.[2]

THE KHĀRIDJITES, FORMATION AND CHARACTERISTICS

The Khāridjites' emergence in religious sects arenas, is one of the significant political and mental alterations in the history of Islam. In fact, the advent of this group is the symbol of hard-line tendencies of the Islamic world in the political and mental areas. A sect which strived for having a place in the realm of politics along two or three countries through applying their extreme view points, but exactly due to this very extremity, were not able to gain a privilege. The important question is that how these incidents appeared. Generally, it ought to be said that when some discrepancies appeared in the Islamic society, various stands were adopted to confront the disputable issues. Some stands had some principal aspects and some others were within the two extremes. If we separate the deviation of apostates and infidels from the Islamic current, the tarring of some people like 'Abd Allāh Ibn 'Umar and Sa'd Waqqas and some others in front of that stand deems a sort of extreme act. In opposition to that, Imām's act was a realistic and principled one. In a stage where this movement failed to pursue its natural course on account of some people's opposition, the hard-line tendency displayed itself. This tendency ought to resist all the currents. Apart from the infidels and fronting the principled movement of Imām, every moment such a stand had a tendency to more extremity and was obliged to separate all the

---

[1]. al-Ghārāt, vol.I, p.346

[2]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.II, pp.413-418

dissenters from its front by the hallmark of infidelity, and to justify its holy war against them.

The tendency towards extremity amongst the Khāridjites was not merely due to the political and intellectual currents, but it had its own specific social and mental aspects as well. Some points should be taken into consideration for understanding the conditions leading, in principle, to such a branching in the society,

(1) During the years when the nomad immigrants had come to Iraq, every time, through participating in the conquest, they gained some noticeable victories, and took the possessions of some countless booties. The front being against them was that of fidelity, the war against which was lawful easily justifiable. They were the mere truth, and the opposite front was the mere error. Djamal battle was the first action during which the Muslims clashed with their coreligionists. In this war despite the victory, there was not any booty and this issue brought about a problem for the aforesaid. Their question was that how it was possible that shedding somebody's blood was allowed, whereas taking his money was not so.[1] This problem demonstrated itself at Djamal battle and naturally caused the primary interpretation of the Muslim nomads to be altered from the holy war and the forces opposing them. The aforesaid problem was attributed to Imām 'Alī (a) by Khāridjites through their objections. Later on, this issue caused the Khāridjites not to leave a medium between infidelity and faith (say unbeliever and infidel libertine, or even a Muslim libertine), rather to bring the problem to an end and to call some (including just themselves) believers and the opposite group unbeliever whose blood was allowed to be shed and whose money to be taken as well.

(2) The other problem arose from the reasons behind revolting against 'Uthmān and finally his murdering. This caliph was accused of religious heresies and his stands caused two diverse deductions from Islam to be drawn among his dissenters and assenters. Such issue has not been recorded before then. In principle, this measure caused the monotonous religious attitude among Muslims to be changed and some suspicions regarding which one is the right of Islam to be induced. It is obvious that this issue itself called for positions against it, which inevitably showed itself within the two extremes. 'Uthmān's murdering caused the religious leadership to be out of the hands of the government and to be in the hands of some personally claiming to be theologians. One of these clans was Kūfa and Damascus[2] "Qur'ān reciters" that through relying on this Qur'ān recitation, restrained

---

[1]. al-Fā'iq,vol.IV,p.129

[2]. See, Waq'at Ṣiffīn, following al-Qurrā' at the list of tribes and clans

themselves from taking part in the battle, and stood between the two armies to see which one is the rightful! The contribution of the Qur'ān-reciters to the conversions leading to the Khāridjites's appearance and even the presence of a number of them amongst the Khāridjites is indicative of this very point. Besides, the independent positions of 'Abd Allāh Ibn Mas'ūd refusing to follow the Imamate of the society have been pointed out. They observe that 'Abd Allāh himself has taken a stand against 'Uthmān and has called 'Uthmān's legitimacy into a serious question, through not allowing 'Uthmān to say his prayers. Through repudiating Imamate, the Khāridjites indicated that they have been impressed with this point. That is to say, they believed that they themselves ought to make decisions on the religion and even their other political affairs, and that, in principle, there is no need to have an Imām. The superficial justification of this matter was that Qur'ān makes them dispense with the need for having an Imām. This arose from the hard-line attitude of the Qur'ān reciters who considered themselves to surpass others and determine their way more properly.

(3) The problem of tribes' domination over the central sovereignty is not an issue to be overlooked easily. This matter was crystallized firstly through the fact that the tribes were not content with Quraysh's domination. Even their admitting of Imām to this extent, was due t the fact that Imām himself was against rather than alongside Quraysh. This is well obvious from the Imām's remarks. Imām regarded Quraysh as his foe.[1] However, ultimately Iraq tribes refused to accept even the Imām, inasmuch as their animosity was far more sever than that permitting them to accept a person having a blood retaliation with Quraysh anyhow. It should be kept in mind that the Khāridjites were a sect not accepting being from Quraysh as a condition for caliphate. As it's been noted, one of the motives behind revolting against 'Uthmān was Egyptian and Iraqi tribes' concern over the indisputable domination of Quraysh, and the Umayya, in particular, over the Muslims' regulations, and specially their financial affairs. The tribal structure in the new Islamic community, had preserved its power. During the first years, the prevalence of central power via religion had somewhat outshined the tribal criteria. However, presently by the victories subsiding, the Iraq tribes have taken notice of themselves, and after revolting against 'Uthmān, their power has been enhanced. When one could dethrone a caliph on account of the crimes he has committed, one could stand up to the next caliph and threaten him with death. Imām (a) was exposed to this issue. He went to Iraq, so to suppress the infidels' riot. Thus he was naturally in need of Kūfiyān tribes' forces. They assisted him to extinguish the sedition. Afterwards, the heads of the tribes having a worthy influence in their own tribe, benefited from this

---

[1]. See, al-Irshād, vol.I, p.254

power as a lever in confronting Imām. Having undermined the central power, finally this issue led to the defeat of this power against Damascus enemy. At Ṣiffīn battle, each tribe resisted, in an orderly way, its enemy through preserving its own tribal structure. From the onset of the establishment, the composition of Kūfiyān population was also on this basis. The influence of tribes' needs was very sweeping and was regarded as a government in a government. Tribes' mutiny against the first two caliphs was unprecedented. 'Uthmān as well withstood these tribes as before. However, his killing demonstrated that he has been defeated against the tribes. It ought to be known that this situation was repeated in Imām 'Alī's (a) caliphate. When the Qur'āns were raised above the spears, the head of Kinda tribes, Ash'ath Ibn Qays said, "You have to send for Ashtar to stop fighting; otherwise, we will kill you as we killed 'Uthmān."[1] Both he and those later being ranked amongst the Khāridjites, compelled Imām to accept Abū Mūsā Ash'arī as his representative.[2] Another group known as Qur'ān-reciters, and having a party under this title in 'Uthmān killing incident, withstood 'Alī (a) and asked him to accept Damascus army request concerning invitation to Qur'ān. Those later on joining the Khāridjites, threatened him that if he won't accept their request, they will kill him just like 'Uthmān.[3] So hereby, the arbitration was imposed on Imām and Imām pointed out repeatedly his unwillingness in this regard,[4] and he regarded this that, لا امر لمن لايطاع "The one not obeyed, can give no order,"[5] as his problem.

When a man went out of the houses of his tribe and went to those of another tribe, and while shouting, sought help from his tribe, his target is to induce disturbance and sedition. The people of the tribe he was among whom, attacked him and beat him. He returned to his tribe and kicked a great disorder, a chaos in which the swords were drawn from the sheaths and a war was waged.[6] Amīr al-Mu'minīn himself introduced the "aged", and the elders as the main foundation of obstinacy, and the chief pillars of sedition.[7] Thereafter, Imām was entangled with these tribes. Some groups from the Iraqi Arabs stood up to him, they were the Khāridjites who not only resisted him, but also wounded his son Imām Ḥasan (a) after him. Supposing

---

[1]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.V, p.50

[2]. Ibid, vol.V, p.51

[3]. Ibid, vol.V, p.49, Waq'at Ṣiffīn, pp.489-490, Mukhtaṣar Tārīkh Dimashq, vol.X, pp.56,60,239; Taṭawwur al-Fikr al-Siyāsī 'Ind ahl al-Sunna, pp.43-44

[4]. Ibid, vol.V, pp.84-85

[5]. Nahdj al-balāgha, Sermon 27

[6]. Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, vol.XIII, pp.167-168

[7]. Nahdj al-balāgha, Sermon 192

that, he has taken no notice of their request concerning the war against Mu'āwiya.

(4) All these incidents happened in an area where, before Islam, there were diverse Christian, Zoroastrian, Mazdaki and various Christian and Jewish tendencies that had crucial influence on the present mental disturbances in these areas. It is not strange to see that major sectarian trends appeared in Iraq. Even amongst the Sunnis, various theological and juristic trends are the fruits of scientific efforts of Iraqi cities. In this regard, Damascus can in no way be compared with Iraq. In contrast, Damascus under Umayya's control chose an easy way in accordance with what the Umayya propagated. As a result of this matter, Damascus dominated Iraq without any trouble and it owed this victory to its unity. Besides, this point should be taken into account that, that number of companions coming to Iraq didn't go to Damascus. This issue was influential in bringing about diverse and apposing courses in Iraq.

(5) The significant concept which can notify of these mental and political disturbances is that of sedition from which every group benefited for their own benefit. Imām 'Alī (a) dissenters, in Imām's was against apostates, believed that this war was nothing but sedition. They believed that in sedition, one ought to be "'Abd Allāh, the murdered", rather than "'Abd Allāh, the murderer".[1] For Imām 'Alī's (a) part, "sedition" title referred to a disturbance in the political circumstances, as well as disobedience to the former caliph of the Muslims. According to the application of sedition in Nahdj al-Balāgha, Imām called those acts leading to Djamal, Ṣiffīn and Nahrawān battles seditious[2], and asked those being alongside it to be like an adolescent camel that has neither a back strong enough for ridding, nor udders for milking.[3] This means that lack of obedience on the part of a rebelling group is called sedition.[4] "Doubt" is the concept resembling sedition, in which the truth and error are intermingled together and remained unknown.[5] Thus, in this way, Djamal and Ṣiffīn battles ought to be regarded as one of the most basic incidents influencing Muslims' political thoughts and making evaluation more difficult for the masses of people due to those doubts raised later on. The emergence of doubt and sedition had an important impact on the formation of hard-line sects trying to bring the work

---

[1]. Masā'il al-imāma, p.16

[2]. See, Nahdj al-balāgha, sermons 93,101,121,192; letters 1,65; Qiṣār al-Ḥikam, No.1

[3]. Nahdj al-balāgha, see, Kalamāt Qiṣār, No.1

[4]. For sedition, see, Bernard Lewis, article "Mafāhīm Inqilāb dar Islām", Taḥqīqāt Islāmī Magezine, No.2/7, pp.93-97

[5]. Nahdj al-balāgha, sermons 38,122, Qiṣār al-Ḥikam, No.113

to an end and wipe sedition off the society by drawing clear lines. The application of equivocal concept made the work much more difficult. The extreme use of "infidelity" concept arose from this need.

(6) The main problem if this group's formation is based on two interrelated implications. The first point is that "judgment" is merely confined to Allāh and it is not correct to leave arbitration to "men". The second point is that this incorrectness is not a simple one, rather it is at the extent of "infidelity" and those learning arbitration to "men" became "infidel". At the outset, this infidelity was put forward with regard to Imām. Supposing that, as it was natural, 'Uthmān should have been considered an infidel too. Ṭalha and Zubayr as well, were not immune to that. Hence, in this way, the concept of "infidelity" took a crucial role in their thought.

As for the issue of *the only judgment is that of Allāh*, the problem lied in defining the term "judgment" According to the evidences, it seems that they have defined "judgment" as "judge". As a result of this issue, not only the arbitration of Abū Mūsā Ash'arī was rejected, but also the "Islamic ruler" existence was doubted. Such a matter sounded unnatural, but it was declared and was repudiated by Amīr al-Mu'minīn (a).

Imām said, "They stated that there is no need for governance, whereas, there is no escape for men from "Imām" pure or impure."

This sentence, (the only judgment is that of Allāh) is a truthful statement, but what (they think) it means, is wrong.[1] Is it possible that the Khāridjites thought concerning not being in need of Imām, arose from their spirit of tribalism and pan-Arabism? It should be known that they had some Qur'ānic reasons, however, their hasty interpretation, originally arising from their harsh morale, resulted in extremely unified meanings.[2] The Khāridjites, during the Imamate of Imām 'Alī (a), didn't have opportunity to put forward their other viewpoints. However, later on, they put forth novel viewpoints in the arenas of political affairs and specifically Imamate. It's noteworthy that their belief concerning "infidelity" had had such a profound impact on the theological discussions that it forced the Islamic sects to react to the subtle definition of faith and infidelity. The Khāridjites extremity with regard to generalizing the concept of infidelity caused all the groups to express their

---

[1]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.II, pp.361-377; Nahdj al-balāgha

[2]. For instance they regarded all those accepting arbitration, and subsequent to that, everyone not considering 'Alī (a) infidel, as infidel, by referring to the verse وَمَنْ لَمْ يَحْكُمْ بِمَا أَنزَلَ اللَّهُ فَأُولَئِكَ هُمُ الْكَافِرُونَ. "and whoever did not judge by what Allāh revealed, those are they that are the unbelievers" and ordered their dissenters' women and children to be murdered by referring to this verse. رَبِّ لَا تَذَرْ عَلَى الْأَرْضِ مِنَ الْكَافِرِينَ دَيَّارًا "My Lord! Leave not upon the land any dweller from among the unbelievers" which was Noah's prayer. See, Masā'il al-imāma, p.19

opinion in this regard. One of these groups was Murdjiyān who said that it is not possible for them to clarify precisely the truth and error, and all ought to be deemed Muslims, and the Shi'ite Muslims and 'Uthmānī disputes as well as judging cardinal sinners should all be left to Allāh.

Thābit Quṭna, a Murdji'ī poet said,

نرجي الامور اذ كانت مشبهة ونصدق القول فيمن جار أو عندا

"We leave (to Allāh) all the dubious affairs, and we judge correctly the oppressor or obstinate."[1]

This curse tried to regard all the opposing groups as Muslim, and hereby to decrease the differences.

Fighting the Khāridjites was not a simple measure. The Khāridjites, for the most part, were among the Qur'ān reciters and those being apparently people of Qur'ān and prayer, and their leader, 'Abd Allāh Ibn Wahb was renowned as Dhū al-Thafanāt (the one whose forehead has been marked by prostration.) In spite of that, he was the most pious of all of them. Hence, he could easily persuade the people of Kūfa and his Shi'ite followers into fighting them. Imām's opinion concerning the Khāridjites has been noted in various sermons. Amongst these remarks, there is an interesting narration. Imām was asked whether the Khāridjites are infidel.

Imām replied, "They have escaped infidelity."

Again he was asked, "Are they hypocrite?"

Imām said, "The hypocrite remember Allāh just a bit, whereas these people call Allāh day and night."

He was asked, "So what kind of people are they?"

Imām said, "They are a group who have been entangled in sedition and thereupon have become blind and deaf."[2]

Imām 'Alī narrated that once the Prophet of Allāh (s) said, "O 'Alī, people will fall into sedition through their wealth, will show obligation on account of their religion, will desire his mercy, and will feel safe from his clout, and regard his unlawful matters as lawful by raising false doubts and by their misguiding desires. They will then hold lawful (the use of) wine by calling it barley water, a bribe by calling it a gift, and taking if usurious interest by calling it sale."

Imām added, "I asked the Prophet of Allāh(s), how should I deal with them at that time, whether to hold them have gone back in heresy or just in sedition?"

He said, "Sedition."[1]

---

[1]. al-Aghānī, vol.XIV, p.269; see, Murdji'a, Tārīkh wa Andīshih, pp.32-39

[2]. Lisān al-'arab, vol.IV, p.461 (following religion)

Perhaps this very remark of the Prophet of Allāh (s), caused Imām's attitude with respect to sedition to be so strong that he indeed regarded the incidents facing him as sedition. The Khāridjites themselves were unable to comprehend this meaning. They expected all to be either faithful or infidel. Anyhow, perhaps on account of the asceticism and the warship that the Khāridjites displayed out of themselves, fighting them was more difficult. However, Mu'āwiya's sedition was far stronger and more dreadful than them.

Hence, Imām said elsewhere, "I have put out the eye of sedition. No one except me advanced towards it when its gloom was swelling and its madness was intense ... when seditions come they refuse (gospel truth against credal error) and when they clear away they leave a warning. They cannot be known at the time of approach but are recognized at the time of return. They blew like the blowing of winds, striking some cities and missing others. Beware that the worst sedition for you in my view, is that of the Umayya, since it is blind dim."[2]

That's why Imām asked his Shi'ite Muslims not to waste their energy fighting the Khāridjites, لا تقتلوا الخوارج من بعدي فليس من طلب الحق فاخطأه كمن طلب الباطل فأدركه "Do not kill the Khāridjites after me, since the one seeking the gospel truth, but going the wrong path is not like the one seeking the credal error and finding it."[3]

By the second group, Imām exactly meant Mu'āwiya and Damascus people. Imām's remark concerning the Khāridjites was that you thought the Khāridjites have been eliminated, but they still exist in the loins of men and wombs of women. Whenever a chief would appear from among them, he would be cut down till the last of them would turn thieves and robbers.[4]

The Khāridjites remained, they went to remote cities, plundering everywhere under the pretext of infidelity. Finally, they went to Sidjistān, and were ranked among those calling themselves 'Ayyār, wanderer.

A point proved to be true regarding Khāridjites and other hardliners is that, their aims may sound more eminent from some aspects; however, their way if action is in such a manner that masses of people cannot be compatible with them. This issue that they regard every cardinal sinner as infidel, is, in itself, a matter that the society cannot admit. Even the Mu'tazilites who considered cardinal sinner neither a faithful nor infidel, rather a libertine person, couldn't influence masses of people. Superficialism

---

[1]. Nahdj al-balāgha, sermon 157

[2]. Ibid, sermon 93

[3]. Ibid, sermon 61

[4]. Ibid, sermon 60

is another Khāridjites characteristic. They were amongst the Qur'ān-reciters and even some of Kūfiyān worshipers. Such members of the society are always threatened with being entangled in the risk of extremity.

INVASIONS OF DAMASCUS ARMY

It was already discussed how Imām's endeavor was focused on re-mobilization of the Iraqis for a battle against Damascus; however, those declaring readiness were few. Though Imām, in his sermons, asked people for an aid, rarely ever did they follow.

In a sermon he has stated, "I come in grips with the crowd laying disobedient when ordered and remaining silent when called. O wrong crowd! Why on earth thou keep waiting? Why thou stand still in helping divine religion? Where is thy religion that prepares thee? Where is thy fervor that outrages thee? Cry I make and help I seek. Neither to my word thou lend an ear nor my order, thou obey until the end comes and the evility turns up. Neither a reprisal thou can join nor can thou lend a hand for an aim to stop thee leaving. Moan thou nipped and move thou never made."[1] In another sermon, "O people in diversity with distressed hearts in reversity! In bodies thou are nude, in intellect thou are dude. In knowing the Truth I cherish thee like a foster-mother. From the Truth you trotter away as goats from a roaring lion. Alas! with thee off justice the darkness I clear, uncrooked path of Truth I gear."[2] "O people laying disobedient if ordered and remaining silent if called! The provided chance never thou take, the challenge never thou dare, thou reproach when likely the crowd prepared behind an Imām, thou withdraw when unwillingly involved in a hard task. O cowards! Why on earth thou keep waiting? Why thou stand still in aiding and taking back thy rights? May thou be dead or despised! By Allāh, far away from me thou shall remain if my hour comes, for thy company I hate. With thee when I am, without help really I am. Who on earth in truth art thou? Thou hast no religion to prepare thee? Thou hast no fervor to propel thee? Not a surprise rogues follow Mu'āwiya when called enjoying no benefit a bit. Thee I call the survivors of Islam and piety to benefit thee a lot. On me thou turn back and with me thou art at odds... What I adore more is death to come forth".[3]

Addressing the people these speeches were delivered by Imām in 39 and 40. They manifest his firm will before the Qāsiṭīn (the oppressors). Mu'āwiya, conscious of the prevailing state in Iraq as well as the resident's

---

[1]. Futūḥ al-buldān, sermon 39

[2]. Ibid. sermon 131

[3]. Futūḥ al-buldān, sermon 180

weakness, was set to undermine Imām's might and set the scene for entering Iraq through attacking on areas ruled by Imām in Ḥidjāz and even in Iraq. He expressed his intention as follows, "The Iraqis will be overawed with such murders and plunder, the dissidents and the secessionists will become valorous and those saved of disputes will be absorbed".[1] The attacks known as "Ghārāt" were repeated every now and then and martyred many a real Shi'ite Muslim anywhere. Abū Isḥāq Thaqafī Shī'ī (born in 283) has presented a list of the Ghārāt in his book authored in the third century under the same title. The reports of such attacks can be found in other historical sources too.

Egypt was the first attacked land. When elected as the caliph, Imām appointed Qays Ibn Sa'd Ibn 'Ubāda to Egypt governorship. Nevertheless, when he left for Iraq to suppress the Nākithīn, (allegiance breachers) he urged him to return from Egypt.[2] Qays set out to Medina and then to Iraq[3] to participate in Ṣiffīn. Subsequent to Ṣiffīn once Egypt was in unrest and an uprising against Muḥammad Ibn Abī Bakr was likely, Imām determined to dispatch Mālik to Egypt.

Appointed for the second time as the governor of Ḥidjāz after Ṣiffīn, Mālik received a letter to go to Egypt. As soon as Mu'āwiya was informed, he wrote to the treasurer in Qulzum to remove Mālik in any way possible and in exchange not to deliver the remainder of treasure. Accordingly, he martyred Mālik with poisonous honey.[4] Where he was martyred was called 'Ayn Shams.

Upon learning Mālik's muder, Mu'āwiya said, "'Alī had got two arms one of which was 'Ammār cut off in Ṣiffīn and the other was Mālik cut off now."[5] On the other hand, when Imām heard the news, sorrow was visible on his face for a number of days stating, "What good features Allāh had granted Mālik! Who Mālik really was! If a mountain, a great mountain he was. If a rock, a solid rock he was. O Mālik! By Almighty Allāh, over your

---

[1]. al-Ghārāt, p.176 (Persion version)

[2]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.II, pp. 390-392

[3]. As reported by Balādhurī in Ashrāf, vol.II, pp. 300-301 when Qays arrived in Medina, Imām had written to Sahl Ibn Ḥunayf to go to Kūfa. Meanwhile, Marwān and Aswad Ibn Abi l-Bakhtarī were active in acting against Imām in Medina. They threatened Qays with murder. Without a moment's hesitation he left there for Iraq. It proves that except Anṣār accompanying Imām to Iraq how much Medina was against Imām.

[4]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.II, pp. 398-399

[5]. al-Ghārāt, vol.I, p. 264; in Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.II, p. 399 the name of Qays Ibn Sa'd is referred to mistakenly.

demise many are grieved while many are thrilled. For such a person tears should be shed. Shall any one be ever re-born like Mālik?"[1]

Now Damascus had access to Egypt, agitated. It not only was adjacent to Damascus but also had many from among the 'Uthmānids who could back the Damascus army. In addition, it was the time to fulfill the promise Mu'āwiya had given to cunning 'Amr Ibn 'Āṣ, the governorship of Egypt. Muḥammad Ibn Abī Bakr was the governor in Egypt then. 'Amr Ibn 'Āṣ who had led the Arabs' army when conquering Egypt before advanced with a massive army. In a letter, he warned Muḥammad to surrender if willing to remain secure. Another threatening letter was sent by Mu'āwiya reading, he knew no other enemy for 'Uthmān but Muḥammad, so the time was ripe for a reprisal. Writing to Imām, he enclosed the two letters with his. Imām recommended him to resist and ordered him to send Kināna Ibn Bishr (allegedly the one who hit 'Uthmān on the head with a mace[2]) to Damascus accompanied by an army but stay with another army in the city. Kināna left with two thousand soldiers and Muḥammad stayed there on alert with the same number. In bravely clashes with Damascus army, Kināna along with his troops were martyred. Muḥammad who was left all alone in Egypt took refuge in a ruined place. The commander of the vanguards in the army was Mu'āwiya Ibn Khudaydj who traced Muḥammad, beheaded him, set him inside a carcass and then burned it.[3] It was the policy that Mu'āwiya and his followers pursued in martyring the divine figures under the pretext of 'Uthmān's murder.

As soon as Imām was told, he turned so gloomy that he made very pungent remarks addressing Kūfa people.

In his sermon, he pointed out, "It exceeded fifty days that I seek help. After such a long period the army recruited is the least mighty one."[4]

It was in this very sermon when Imām declaimed, ألا دين يجمعكم ألا حميّة تغضبكم؟[5] "Where is thy religion that prepares thee? Where is thy fervor that outrages thee? "

When asked for what his grief was Imām responded, "He was as dear as my sons".[6] Suffering the loss of Muḥammad Ibn Abī Bakr, one of his closest

---

[1]. al-Ghārāt, vol.I, p. 265 (The Persion translation is adapted from Āyatī's book)

[2]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.II, p. 401

[3]. al-Ghārāt, vol.I, pp. 276-289

[4]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.II, p. 404

[5]. al-Ghārāt, vol.I, p. 291

[6]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.II, p. 404. Muḥammad's mother, Asmā' Bint 'Umays, was first Dja'far's wife after whose martyrdom got married Abū Bakr. After Abū Bakr's demise she married Imām 'Alī (a), thus Muḥammad was cherished in Imām's family.

companions, as well as Egypt, Imām wrote to all Muslims in various spots recounting the agonies he had suffered since the Prophet's departure. He, in the letter, referred to the unjust attitude that there had been concerning the Prophet's household following his departure, nation's allegiance, how Nākithīn breached their allegiance, how the war of Ṣiffīn was waged and how the Khāridjites stood against him. Then touching upon the excuses people made he added, "What thou nagged was Blunt art our swords and blank art our quiver. No bayonets do our spears hast and sticks at what we call spears. Let us return to get prepared with the best of horses and weapons...' I did order thee to dismount in Nukhayla, set up a camp and stay there on standby ... A crowd of thee stayed with me making unjustifiable excuses and another group left me disobeying. Neither firm were those who stayed nor returned those who left. Once noticing the camp, less than fifty soldiers I found. I headed for Kūfa disappointedly but as yet, out hast thou never stepped. Why on earth thou keep waiting? A blind eye hast thou turned to that thy lands get shrunk, thy towns get occupied and my Shi'ite Muslims get slayed? Not a border guard is seen on the borders but enemy's." Furthermore, Imām urged them to prepare against the rival.[1]

Muḥammad Ibn Abī Bakr's murder was considered as a triumph for the 'Uthmānids around the globe in Mu'āwiya's view.[2] Egypt which was now out of Imām's hand was ruled by 'Amr Ibn 'Āṣ as late as his death in 43 for three or four years who preferred the worldly life in exchange for the abiding one in the Hereafter.

About Baṣra also Mu'āwiya was hopeful as Baṣra 'Uthmānids had written to him seeking for help. He was well aware of the grudge Baṣra people bore Imām 'Alī (a) for they had lost many in Djamal war. According to Thaqafī, in order to consult 'Amr Ibn 'Āṣ Mu'āwiya wrote, "Nowhere can a belligerent and invincible crowd be found as many as Baṣra people." Mu'āwiya called upon 'Abd Allāh Ibn 'Āmir Ḥaḍramī to travel to Baṣra to mobilize Mu'āwiya's followers under the slogan of revenge for 'Uthmān's murder and occupy the town. Meeting the Tamīmītes in Baṣra, 'Abd Allāh talked to the 'Uthmānids having gathered. On propounding his aim Ḍaḥḥāk Ibn 'Abd Allāh Hilālī objected to him as saying, "Do you order us to unsheathe our swords once again (after Nākithīn) and battle with one another in order to let Mu'āwiya still be on the throne and you be his minister and to breach the allegiance we have sworn to 'Alī (a)? By Allāh, one single day of 'Alī's lifetime spent when the Prophet alive was far much better than whatsoever Mu'āwiya and his lineage have ever carried out." Some were in 'Abd Allāh Ibn 'Āmir's side and some in Ḍaḥḥāk's. As a rule,

---

[1]. al-Ghārāt, vol.I, pp.302-322

[2]. Ibid. vol.II, p. 377

the majority backed Ibn Amīr other than a few like Aḥnaf Ibn Qays. Between the Muḍarī and Yemenī Arabs there was a strife; however, Mu'āwiya had previously advised 'Abd Allāh to trust the Muḍarī ones. It upset the Azdītes. At the same time Ziyād Ibn 'Ubayd who was the vicegerent of Baṣra governor resorted to Ṣabra Ibn Shaymān Azdī and wrote to 'Abd Allāh Ibn 'Abbās, Baṣra governor, in Kūfa; as a result, the news of Baṣra spread. On the one hand Ziyād supported by the Azdītes led Friday prayer and urged then to back Amīr al-Mu'minīn with whom Anṣār and Muhādjirūn were and stand against the Tamīmītes. On the other hand Ibn 'Āmir organized an army in Baṣra and took the possession of some properties. The news of the Azdītes' support for Ziyād and the Tamīmītes' for Ibn 'Āmir created chaos in Kūfa. Imām was demanded by Shabath Ibn Rib'ī not to let the Azdītes overcome the Tamīmītes. Nonetheless, Mikhnaf Ibn Sulaym advocated the Azdītes. Urging them to back the principles of the religion, Imām advised, "Thou should restrain from battling and insulting one another for the sake of Islam and its reputation and unite". Imām sent Ziyād Ibn Ḍubay'a from the tribe of Tamīm to Baṣra for hindering the Tamīmītes to support Ibn 'Āmir. His attempt was a little fruitful. Bu while asleep at night, a number of the Khāridjites attacked him and killed him running away.

Sent by Imām together with fifty of the Tamīmītes to Baṣra, Djāria Ibn Qudāma met with the Shi'ite Muslims and read out Imām's letter to them. Regarding the allegiance people had sworn Imām had written, "If keep thy allegiance, if follow my advice and if obey my order, in line with the Divine Book and the Prophet's tradition I shall treat thee and the path of Truth I shall raise among thee. By Allāh, no other ruler do I know to be well aware of his tradition but myself since Muḥammad passed away. The gospel truth is what I tell. I intend neither to reproach the deceased nor to find fault with their deeds." Then Imām had added that if they breached their allegiance, he would suppress them with his army. To make up the incident of Djamal, the Azdītes declared their readiness for a battle against Ibn 'Āmir. After a time of being under siege, the 'Uthmānids's houses were razed to the ground at Djāria's behest. In a letter Ziyād notified Imām that a number were burned, a number who fled fell prey to swords and a number who surrendered were pardoned.[1]

The movement led by Ḍaḥḥāk Ibn Qays, a well-known commander of Damascus army, is among Damascus invasions. As reported by Thaqafī when the Khāridjites revolted against Imām, 'Umāra Ibn 'Uqba Ibn Abī Mu'ayṭ wrote to Mu'āwiya, "A group of the Qur'ān reciters and the devout from among 'Alī's followers have stood against him. Combating them, 'Alī

---

[1]. al-Ghārāt, vol.II, pp.373-412

has killed them. And now since his army and the inhabitants of his town have taken up arms against him, the seeds of discord are sowed among them." Mu'āwiya, extremely delighted, sent Ḍaḥḥāk Ibn Qays along with a three - or four – thousand soldier army to Iraq and ordered him to loot anywhere he went, kill any Shi'ite Muslim he noticed and then leave there promptly for another place. Ḍaḥḥāk who went to Kūfa not only plundered people's properties but also rushed a caravan of pilgrims and killed a number. Imām 'Alī (a) in Kūfa called upon people to defend themselves.

When Imām found them that indifferent, he told them, "By Almighty Allāh, I wish I had one of thee in lieu of a hundred men of thee." Once more Imām desired to be dead! Then Imām sent Ḥudjr Ibn 'Adī with four thousand troops to stop Ḍaḥḥāk. Ḥudjr encountered him in Tadmur and in their clash, nineteen soldiers from the rival army were killed and two people on Ḥudjr's side were martyred. With Ḍaḥḥāk's overnight escape another invasion of Damascus was ended.

In the meanwhile 'Aqīl Ibn Abī Ṭālib wrote to Imām to be kept abreast of the latest developments. Describing Ḍaḥḥāk's invasion abortive, Imām referred to the injustice Quraysh had done to him and wrote, "O Allāh! A calamity thou descend for Quraysh to sever their kinship with me, for those allying and usurping my right of ruling left behind by my brother, Muḥammad. To the one they gave it whose neither kinship with the Prophet (s) nor record in Islam was like those of mine". The letter indicates how Imām constantly mentioned his usurped right any chance he got.[1] The other invasion made by Damascus army to Iraq was the one headed by Nu'mān Ibn Bashīr with two thousand soldiers. He was supposed to attack on 'Ayn al-Tamr, on the outskirts of the Euphrates. He was the one and the only one from Anṣār who had joined the 'Uthmānids. Although there were a number of Anṣār who had balked at supporting Imām 'Alī (a), never did they join Mu'āwiya. When Mālik Ibn Ka'b deployed with a hundred heard about Bashīr's probable attack, he asked Sulaym for help who was the treasurer in that side of the Euphrates. Imām learning the news of Nu'mān's attack on the one hand and observing the Kūfiyāns hesitant to rise on the other hand objected to them as uttering,"O Kūfiyāns! When the vanguards of Damascus army thou notice, the doors thou shut and into homes thou creep like a lizard in to its hole and a hyena in to its den. By Allāh, how abject is the one whose helpers art thou!"

Sulaym sent fifty of his troops led by his son, 'Abd Allāh, for Mālik's aid. Damascus army afraid of the aid army upcoming fled after a short clash. Mu'āwiya said his intention of sending the army had been "To jeopardize the Iraqis". Anyhow, this attack was fruitless as well.

---

[1]. al-Ghārāt, vol.II, pp.416-442

Following Imām's remarks it was 'Adī Ibn Ḥātim who accompanied a thousand people from the tribe of Ṭayy to Nukhayla. Another a thousand also joined him and they advanced towards the banks of Euphrates and made several attacks on southern part of Damascus.[1]

Mu'āwiya sent an army to Dūmat al-Djandal to have them, obedient to neither Damascus nor Iraq, pay tax alms (statutory Islamic levy on specified items to be used for Muslims' welfare). Another army led by Mālik Ibn Ka'b was sent by Imām too. A fight was started between them which lasted a whole day long. Next day Damascus army returned while Mālik stayed there for ten days inviting people to help. Not being helped, he returned disappointedly as well.[2]

One of the other invasions made against Iraq was led by Sufyān Ibn 'Awf Ghāmidī along with six thousand toward Hīt and then toward Anbār. Imām's adherents were few there none of whom were willing helpers except a very small number with Ashras Ibn Ḥassān Bakrī who resisted unit being martyred. After plundering Anbār, the invaders went back. On being informed, Imām on the pulpit of the mosque, summoned people to gather in Nukhayla and move to stop them. In the answer, nothing came up but silence. Imām left the mosque and sent Sa'īd Ibn Qays Hamdānī together with an eight-thousand army to stop them but they had already arrived in Damascus.

When Sa'īd returned, he found Imām so seriously sick that he could in no way stand on the pulpit. Imām therefore wrote a letter complaining about Kūfiyān people, sat on the platform by the mosque gate and asked Sa'd, one of his Mawālīs (freed slaves) to read it out loud. "If any other option there were, never a word would I breath to blame thee ... O people, Djihād (holy Islamic war) is a portal of the Heaven portals opened to Allāh's special friends, attire of piety, chain mail of solidity and a shield of inflexibility... Be informed, daily and nightly, overtly and covertly for a battle with thy foes I invited thee, to attack them before being attacked ...? Enable thou remained and disobedient thou laid until the enemy occupied thy homeland. It was Ghāmidī who assaulted Anbār, slayed Ashras Ibn Ḥassān, plundered the weapons and massacred the righteous men. Even I heard no one stopped the man, from among thy foes, who invaded the house of a Muslim woman, under our protection, took her anklets off her ankles and her earrings off her ears. Yet, safe and sound they returned with not a single injury. If this life a Muslim man departed ashamed and saddened of such an act, never should he be blamed for my part. Wonder! What grief I suffer and what pain I bear when in accord I find them in credal error and in discord I find thee gospel

---

[1]. al-Ghārāt. vol.II, pp.445-459

[2]. al-Ghārāt. vol.II, pp.459-461

in Truth ...! O wrong crowd under the guise of right men! O gang of the foolish like the kids and the brides in bridal chambers! Allāh solely knows how dejectedly I keep living amongst thee! I beg Him from thee to take me and toward Himself to ascend me...".[1]

These remarks could merely persuade three hundred to gather in Nukhayla. Imām's next sermons bore no fruit as well.[2]

Prior to Ḥadjdj season in 39 AH. Mu'āwiya dispatched an army to Mecca with Yazīd Ibn Shadjara Rahāwī as the head to absorb people to Mu'āwiya during Ḥadjdj period. On the other hand, Imām being told of his intention, sent a group commanded by Ma'qal Ibn Qays Riyāḥī to Mecca. Qutham Ibn 'Abbās who was the governor imagined that no one would defend him, so decided to leave Mecca first but they trusted its holiness and stayed. It was Dhi l-Ḥadjdja 7th when Damascus army arrived in Mecca. To avoid clashes, the commander for whom observing the holiness of the city was allegedly significant sent a message to Qutham that both give up leading the congregational prayers and let people pick one out. As soon as Ḥadjdj ritual terminated, Damascus army returned. Following the Damascus army, Ma'qal Ibn Qays went to Mecca and moved as far as Wādī al-Qurā. They could only capture a few numbers of the fatigued ones who were exchanged later for Iraqi captives. After the event, Imām told people,"Defeated thou hast become be this nation ... for the more active they get, the more passive thou go; the harder they try, the lazier thou become. I do behold disunity among thee as unity among them..."[3]

One of their most notorious attacks was Busr Ibn Arṭāt's on Ḥidjāz and Yemen. He, a ruthless criminal, was ordered by Mu'āwiya to massacre 'Alī's Shi'ite Muslims anywhere he traced. Why Busr was dispatched was the 'Uthmānids living in Yemen had revolted against 'Ubayd Allāh Ibn 'Abbās, the governor, after realizing weakness within Iraqi troops. They had written to Mu'āwiya seeking for help. First Busr entered Medina of which governor, Abū Ayyūb Anṣārī, had been appointed by Imām. Having no troop he had to flee. Busr set fire to his and others' houses, secured allegiance from people by force, designated Abū Hurayra as the governor and sent him to Mecca. Qutham Ibn 'Abbās also left there and fled. Busr then set out to Ṭā'if where he sent a man from Quraysh to Tabāla therein many a Shi'ite Muslim resided. At his behest, all were slayed and their possessions were plundered. Mecca residents, panic-stricken, had to flee among whom were 'Ubayd Allāh Ibn 'Abbās's wife along with his two sons, Sulaymān and Dāwūd captured and both beheaded. It is said that they were

---

[1]. al-Ghārāt, pp.179-181 (Persian version); Akhbār al-ṭiwāl, pp.211-212

[2]. al-Ghārāt, pp.464-503

[3]. Ibid. vol.II, pp. 504-516

murdered in Yemen concealed in an Iranian-born man's house. Keeping on his trip, he went to Nadjrān where he killed 'Ubayd Allāh Ibn 'Abbās's father in law, 'Abd Allāh Ibn 'Abd al-Muddān. This very event is very considerable in Mu'āwiya's shameful political life. When Busr arrived in Yemen, 'Ubayd Allāh had already left. Although a number of Shi'ite Muslims defied for a while many were martyred. Busr committed countless crimes. He beheaded one hundred Iranian-born Shi'ite Muslims. Then he moved toward Ḥadramawt where allegedly numerous Shi'ite Muslims resided. He had said he would kill one out of four. Upon being informed, Imām sent Djāria Ibn Qudāma with an army to follow him. When Djāria heard that Busr had gone to Mecca, he went there but he had already left. When arriving in Kūfa, Djāria found Imām 'Alī (a) martyred, so he swore allegiance to Imām Ḥasan (a).

Imām who was extremely annoyed with the Kūfiyāns, pronounced a malediction, for not only had they left Imām helpless but also they never protected their wives and daughters and allowed Damascus wicked men to access them. As an instance we narrate a malediction of Imām 'Alī's here,"I saw 'Alī (a) speaking to people", Abū Ṣāliḥ Ḥanafī, "While having the Holy Qur'ān on his head, the papers of which rustling". 'Alī was uttering, "O Allāh! From whatever written in this Book they prevented me. Upon me thou bestow any what of this Book".

O Allāh! In disfavor I hold them as so they hold me and of them I hast become tried as of me they haste become so. Unlike my nature is what they force me to act, an action unknown to me as yet. O Allāh! Better than them grant me helpers but worse than me to them. O Allāh! Dissolve their heart like salt in water.[1]

IMĀM 'ALĪ'S MARTYRDOM

In was Ramaḍān, 19th 40 A.H. at dawn when Imām was preparing to head for Ṣiffīn to battle once again with Mu'āwiya but he was wounded by the most black-hearted man in the world named 'Abd al-Raḥmān Ibn Muldjam Murādī and martyred three days later on Ramaḍān 21st.

As reported by Ibn Sa'd, three Khāridjites called 'Abd al-Raḥmān Ibn Muldjam, Burak Ibn 'Abd Allāh Tamīmī and 'Amr Ibn Bukayr Tamīmī allied in Mecca to kill Imām 'Alī (a), Mu'āwiya and 'Amr Ibn 'Āṣ. To visit his Khāridjites' friends, 'Abd al-Raḥmān went to Kūfa. Once he went to meet a group from the tribe of "Taym al-Rabbāb", he saw a girl called Quṭām Bnt Shadjanna Ibn 'Adī whose father and brothers had been killed in Nahrawān. When Ibn Muldjam proposed to her, she declared that her

---

[1]. al-Ghārāt. p. 174 (translated by Āyatī)

marriage portion should be 3000 (Dīnār!) in addition to Imām 'Alī's murder. He told that by accident with this very aim he had traveled to Kūfa.[1] He smeared his sword with poison and attacked Imām on the head. The deepness of the wound as well as the poison of the sword martyred Imām. Reportedly, Ibn Muldjam had been in Ash'ath Ibn Qays's house that night.[2]

Various narrations indicate that Imām was attacked by Ibn Muldjam inside the mosque.[3] In accordance to other ones, he attacked Imām while he was waking people up for prayer.[4] Many historical sources have referred to the former although many reports recorded say Imām was attacked while doing prayer. Maytham Tammār had reported that Imām had started his Dawn Prayer and no sooner had he recited eleven verses of the Sūra of "the Prophets" than Ibn Muldjam wounded Imām on the head.[5] As narrated by one of Dju'da Ibn Hubayra's descendants, Imām was wounded while doing his prayer.[6] The man above-mentioned, Dju'da, had been Umm Hānī's son who every so often had led the prayers as a substitute leader and narratedly he had been the one who completed the prayer when Imām was attacked. Shiykh Ṭūsī has also confirmed the aforesaid narration.[7] Yet, Muttaqī Hindī's report had been that Ibn Muldjam had hit Imām when Imām was prostrating back.[8] Ibn Ḥanbal[9] together with Ibn 'Asākir[10] has confirmed the report. Ibn 'Abd al-Barr stated that there had been no consensus on whether Imām was attacked while doing the prayer or before it and whether any one substituted him or he himself led the prayer to the end. Many are of the opinion that Imām had Dju'da Ibn Hubayra lead the incomplete prayer.[11]

A great number of hadiths have been narrated by the Holy Prophet's Household and the Sunnis concerning how Imām felt during the night before being wounded. Ibn Abi l-Dunyā quoted Imām Bāqir(a) as saying that Imām

---

[1]. Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā, vol. 3, pp. 35-38

[2]. Maqtal al-imām Amīr al-Mu'minīn, p. 36, No.13

[3]. Ibid. p.29, No.4; p. 35, No.12

[4]. Ibid. pp.28,33, No.11

[5]. Ibid. p. 30, No.5

[6]. Ibid. p.30, No.6

[7]. al-Amālī, al-Djuz' al-thālith, No.18

[8]. Kanz al-'Ummāl, vol.XV, p.170 (2nd edition); al-Amālī fī Āthār ṣaḥāba, pp. 103-104

[9]. al-Faḍā'il, p.38, No.63 (published in Qum)

[10]. Tardjamat al-imām 'Alī Ibn Abī Ṭālib (a), vol.III, p. 361 (2nd edition)

[11]. al-Istī'āb (in the margin of al-Iṣāba), vol.III, p. 59

had been fully aware of his martyrdom.[1] As soon as being injured, Imām shouted out, فزت ورب الكعبة "By Allāh of Ka'ba, to salvation I reached."[2]

Ibn Abi l-Dunyā has narrated Imām's will in different ways which included both financial and religious issues. The salient issues recommended by Imām were as follows,

Observation of kinship, heed to the orphans and the neighbors, following the guidelines of the Holy Qur'ān, performing prayers as the pillar of the religion, Ḥadjdj, fasting, Djihād, Zakāt (tax alms) following the Holy Prophet's infallible Household, serving Allāh's servants, enjoining to good and forbidding from evil. Reportedly, on Ramaḍān 21st, while Imām was whispering, لااله الا الله "There is no God but Allāh" and the verse of, فمن يعمل مثقال ذرة خيرا يره ومن يعمل مثقال ذرة شرا يره "So he who has done an atom's weight of good shall see it. And he who had done an atom's weight of evil shall see it" Breathed his last.*3* According to another narration, after Imām's martyrdom, Imām Ḥasan (a) and Imām Ḥusayn (a), Muḥammad Ibn Ḥanafiyya, 'Abd Allāh Ibn Dja'far as well as few numbers from the household took Imām (a) out of Kūfa nightly and hiddenly from sight buried him. It was because the Khāridjites and the Umayyads might exhume Imām.[4]

Upon hearing the news of Imām 'Alī's martyrdom, a group of the Exaggerators in Ctesiphon did never believe their ears. This group is the initiator of the exaggerating thoughts among the Shi'ite Muslims whom we will address later. Ibn Abi l-Dunyā's report in this respect referred to a person named Ibn al-Sawdā' from the tribe of Hamdān know as 'Abd Allāh Ibn Saba'. Elsewhere, the name of 'Abd Allāh Ibn Wahb al-Sabā'ī, was mentioned and that such a claim had been made in Ctesiphon.[5] Both narrations reveal that the person had even been anonymous. See also 'Uthmān's Opponents.

IMĀM 'ALĪ'S LIFE

The analysis of Imām's lifestyle as a paragon seems beyond the possibility here; yet, we refer to some aspects for luck in brief.

---

[1]. al-Istī'āb. pp. 33-34, No.12; Abū Nu'aym along with many others have narrated that the Prophet had already foretold his martyrdom. Ma'rifat al-ṣaḥāba, vol.I, pp. 295-296.

[2]. Ibid. p.39, No.20; footnote, al-Imāma wa l-siyāsa, p.160, Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.II, p. 499

[3]. Maqtal al-imām Amīr al-Mu'minīn, pp. 45-46

[4]. Ibid. p.79, No.68

[5]. Ibid. p.92, No.85; p.96, No.91

Imām's political and social life is so exemplary that it can be deemed utopian. At times, so uniquely firm was he regarding divine decrees that not a single one could ever emulate him as he himself had pointed to it in a letter.[1] For those yearning to be faithful to it, his lifestyle is a perfect pattern. Every time we can learn from it but the way is still too long to go. In other wards, Imām's lifestyle has been the best during man's life. It belongs to a perfect man who can indeed be called human and Allāh's successor on the earth. Such an engrossing life did he have that it had his friends reach the zenith of amity and his enemies reach the zenith of enmity in front of him.

In this regard, the Prophet (s) has stated, يهلك فيك الرجلان محب مفرط ومبغض مفرط[2] His withstanding for the sake of the path of Truth does incense the enemy that it makes him go to extremes whereas it does fan the blames of his friend's love that he may go to extremes.

The one feeling affection for him can ascend as highly as the rank to be called a devoted Shi'ite Muslim but if he neglected slightly he would be affected by the exaggerating tendency. Rarely ever has it be seen that divinity be attributed to a person. 'Alī (a), however, in a community where Allāh had underscored the humanity of the prophet Muḥammad(s) was targeted by such attribution although Imām opposed it severely.

Imām's asceticism is what overshadowed all his life. He was an ascetic man who turned back on anything though he was entitled to possess everything. A group asked about the most ascetic man in the presence of 'Umar Ibn 'Abd al-'Azīz. Some named Abūdhar and 'Umar but 'Umar Ibn 'Abd al-'Azīz said,أزهد الناس علي بن ابيطالب (ع) "No one is the most ascetic but 'Alī Ibn Abī Ṭālib."[3]

Imām not only associated with the poor but also behaved kindly towards them.[4] He was sometimes seen doing prayer or delivering a sermon wearing his one and the only shirt wet.[5] Repeatedly, Imām has referred to his simple life in Nahdj al-Balāgha. Noticing that Imām ate very frugal food, one of his disciples told him, أبالعراق تصنع هذا؟ العراق أكثر خيراً وأكثر طعاماً... "Do you eat such food in Iraq where the best food can he found?"[6]

---

[1]. Nahdj al-balāgha, letter 45

[2]. This Hadith is the one repeated many times. Imām also stated, يهلك فيك الرجلان، محب مفرط ومبغض مفرط Two people are murdered for me, extremist friend and hardline foe Nahdj al-balāgha, sermon 127

[3] al-Mi'yār wa l-muwāzina, p.240

[4]. Ibid. p.240

[5]. Ibid. p.240

[6] Ibid. p.244

Imām was the first one who practiced what he peached objecting to 'Uthmān Ibn Ḥunayf in Nahdj al-Balāgha or in his public sermons concerning this worldly life.

Aswad Ibn Qays recounted that Imām 'Alī (a) fed the Kūfiyāns on the fertile land of the mosque but he himself ate the food in his house.

One of his disciples said, "I said to myself that 'Alī eats more delicious food at home than what he gives people. So I left my food half eaten and followed him. He called Fiḍḍa and asked her to prepare the food. She brought a loaf of bread and yogurt diluted with water. He dipped the pieces of bread in the liquid while it was with bran. I asked him why he had not asked for bread baked with flour without bran. Shedding tears, he answered, "By Allāh, neverever bread without bran was found in the Prophet's house."[1]

'Uqba Ibn 'Alqama narrated,"When I met Imām 'Alī (a), there was sour yogurt diluted with water in front of him that was so sour and watery that it upset me. I asked him whether he would eat it.O Aba l-Khabūb, worse than this was the prophet's food and rougher than mine was his clothes.

Imām answered, "I fear if I did not do what he had done, I would never join him".[2] When a special food was brought for Imām, Imām stated, "Never do I eat what the Prophet (s) had never eaten".[3]

It does not imply that eating such food is unlawful but sheer act of following Allāh's Messenger is of supreme importance for an Imām.

Presenting another example appears appropriate. As recounted by Abu l-Shiykh Anṣārī, born in 369, Imām appointed 'Amr Ibn Salama as the governor of Iṣfahān. When setting out for Kūfa, 'Amr was intercepted by the Khāridjites. With the tributes and the gifts, he had to settle in Ḥulwān. As soon as the Khāridjites went away, he left the tributes in Ḥulwān and took the gifts with him to Kūfa. Imām ordered him to lay them on the fertile land by Kūfa Mosque and then distribute among Muslims. Umm Kulthūm, Imām's daughter, sent for 'Amr to send her some honey brought. He sent her two cans then. When Imām came to the mosque for prayer, he realized that the honeys were two less. He called 'Amr and asked where the two others were. He answered, "Do not ask what happened", then he went and brought two cans of honey and added to them.

Imām repeated,"I only wanted to know what happened to those two".

"Umm Kulthūm demanded to send honey to her", answered 'Amr.

"Not have I told you to distribute the gifts among people?" Imām asked.

---

[1]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.II p.187; al-Ghārāt, vol.I, pp.85,87,88

[2]. al-Ghārāt, vol.I, p.85

[3]. Ibid. pp.88-89; the footnotes of the same pages

He sent for her to send the honey back. When brought back a little was consumed. He sent for the traders to estimate the price of the subtracted amount. It was three or so dhms. Imām sent for Umm Kulthūm to pay for it. Then, the honey was distributed among Muslims. [1]

Numerous examples can be found in al-Ghārāt and other books.

It is Imām's own statement, أنا الذي أهنت الدنيا[2] "I am the one who despised this world."

That manifests his stance against this worldly life. Imām's behavior towards the agents is another dimension of his life addressed in historical sources. From any point of view, Imām supervised his agents and during his short term, many letters were written by him reprimanding them. After 'Alī's martyrdom, Sūda, 'Umāra Hamdānī's daughter, came up to Mu'āwiya. She had participated in Ṣiffīn. For a short while, Mu'āwiya talked her about Ṣiffīn. She requested him to depose Busr Ibn Arṭāt oppressing them. He declined, however. Sūda consequently prostrated and an hour later rose up. Mu'āwiya asked her what it was for.

She responded,"When I went to 'Alī to complain about the man responsible for our alms, he was busy with praying. After his prayer, he asked me what I wanted. On hearing with no delay he took a piece of skin out of his pocket and urging him to observe justice he wrote, "As soon as receiving the letter, do what ordered until I send one to replace you. He gave the letter to me to hand in him. He was deposed accordingly."[3]

---

[1]. Ṭabaqāt al-muḥaddithīn bi-Iṣbahān, vol.I, Akhbār Iṣbahān, vol.I, p.72

[2]. Ḥayāt al-ṣaḥāba, vol.II, p.310

[3]. al-Futūḥ, vol.III, pp.90-92

CHAPTER V
IMĀM ḤASAN'S IMAMATE

ACQUAINTANCE WITH THE KŪFIYĀNS

Iraq has been an Islamic land that dominated over Islamic world throughout caliphate life for centuries and therein numerous important developments were embedded. With two cities of Baṣra and Kūfa it initially appeared under the name of "'Arāqiyan" and later with the appearance of Baghdād it played a more important role. The time we talk about is when it is still a hundred years left to Baghdād emergence. Baṣra, for years after the event of Djamal, was 'Uthmānids.[1] Although it was somewhat moderated with the Mu'tazilites' (schismatic) penetration later. On the other hand, Kūfa has always been known as a Shi'ites center that did adhere to its belief during the Umayyads's authority and later on. On different occasions this city has been "reproached" on the one hand and admired on the other, thus different judgments have been passed about the Kūfa people as follows,

A. These people on different occasions took different positions. Once they rose for defending Ahl al-Bayt and strengthened the 'Alawites with their courage and it was their assistance that helped Imām defeat Nākithīn. Yet, it was the last years of Imām 'Alī's caliphate when they hesitated to help him, so the gospel. Truth was defeated and the credal error won. Though many[2], later they left Ḥasan Ibn 'Alī (a) helpless on his own as well. Such a tragedy was also repeated in Muḥarram 61. However, many of them under the name of Tawwābīn (the Penitents) repended and in a movement were martyred. Another group allied with Mukhtār Ibn Abī 'Ubayd to take revenge for Imām Ḥusayn's assassin to show their Shi'ites stance. With not helping Zayd Ibn 'Alī in 122 H. they proved their unfaithfulness to the 'Alawites.

B. The why of such contradictory judgments is the existence of various political and religious groups in the city. One group was the Khāridjites,

---

[1]. Musnad Ibn Dja'd, vol.I, p.527. the report was denied that Qatāda in the second century heard that there be a number in Baṣra who claimed that they considered 'Alī superior to 'Uthmān. "By Allāh, no resident before you had ever believed so", he said.

[2]. These Shi'ites Muslems were mostly political and they never believed that Imām Ḥasan (a) was oppointed by Allāh as an Imām.

another was somehow the Umayyads' accomplice as the noble and the other group was the Shi'ite Muslims, Ahl al-Bayt's devotees from among whom the righteous were praised for their right deeds and the wicked kept on until they murdered the prophet's son.

C. The existence of the tribes was also influential in people's quick stance changing. They went to extremes in their tribal prejudice so irrationally that they made rash decisions on any trivial affair. Mostly in favor of the tribes were the decisions, so they threatened the Kūfiyān's unity, exactly what the Umayyads took advantage of several times.

Here it looks essential that we get acquainted with the Iraqi's state on the threshold of Ḥasan Ibn 'Alī's Imamate. Were these people familiarized, the next developments in Iraq would be well comprehended.

Doing research on Imām Ḥasan's disciples, Shiykh Mufīd classified people into categories. Imām 'Alī's Shi'ite Muslims; the Khāridjites who were intent on fighting Mu'āwiya and due to Imām Mudjtabā's intention of battling against Damascus allied with him. Those greedy for the booty; Common people negligent of what to do; and the group included those with tribal prejudice who obeyed their chiefs disregarding the religion.[1]

The number of those belonging to the third group exceeded all. As Iraq was the center of eastern conquests, they gained a great deal of booty in all wars. Yet, since Imām 'Alī's entrance to the land civil wars began; therefore, they assumed the 'Alawites as debtors.[2] After Nahrawān, they did not deem to the good of themselves to start a new war in the prevailing status. With the rumors spread by Mu'āwiya's spies in Iraq, doubt expanded among the Iraqis. The Khāridjites' emergence added to their doubt and undermined them to understand the situation.

Regardless of what said above, the people of Iraq, as matter of fact, had expressed themselves encountering the rulers of a hundred years. The honor they had gained during the years of conquering Iran had made them dominant over the Prophet's Medina and when dissatisfied of any ruler, they compelled even 'Umar to depose him. The figures who were not among the tricksters seemed to be defeated. 'Ammār Ibn Yāsir as a righteous man as well as Sa'd Ibn Abī Waqqāṣ as an un-political person could never tolerate the state of Kūfa. In spite of it Mughīra Ibn Shu'ba, a powerful debauchee (as described by 'Umar), could rule over Kūfa for years.[3]

---

[1]. al-Irshād, Vol.II, p.10; al-Fuṣūl al-muhimma, p.147; Biḥār al-anwār, vol.XXXXIV, pp.46, 56; Manāqib, Ibn Shahr Āshūb, vol.IV, p.32; Ṣulḥ al-imām al-Ḥasan (a), pp.68-69

[2]. Later you will see how Imām Mudjtabā has proved it.

[3]. See the section about "Caliph II's Agent"

Later on, with Imām 'Alī's emigration from Medina to Kūfa, it developed and the significance of its role in the Islamic world multiplied. His ethical and scientific background as well as his devotion during the life of Islam led people to rise up and help him. The Prophet's disciples and his own close followers joining to his army added to his might and allowed no one to overcome him for a time. but, after the issue of arbitration was broached in Ṣiffīn, they found a justification for standing against Imām 'Alī (a) and after suppressing the Khāridjites, they, under the pretext of fatigue, drew back from the internal affairs. Imām stated that although a ruler, he had been oppressed by people.[1] People's present state made Imām announce that he was by no means able to reform them. Though he could rule over them by force, it was never the way he did ever choose.

He himself has described them well enough, "O people of Kūfa! With Qur'ānic advice thee I reproached, fruitless it was. With rods thee I threatened, useless it was. With whips thee I punished, pointless if was. The only means to reform thee is sword, but at a cost of thy reforming never do I excite discord."[2] Sword was the one and the only thing that could make the people of Iraq obedient. This fact has been confirmed throughout history. If anyone like 'Alī (a) and his progeny had never desired to make use of force, that is to impose something the people hated, neverever could he have succeeded.

Such rulers as Ziyād, his son, 'Ubayd Allāh, or Ḥadidjādj could pacify Iraq. Despotism was what could remove the tensions. Mukhtār also could rule for a short time with his policy but because not despotic, he could never unite Kūfa let alone Iraq.

Amīr al-Mu'minīn, the Commander of the Faithful, has expressively described this nation. He has likened them to a pregnant woman who aborts her baby at the very last moment after bearing the sever pain of pregnancy.[3] To camels without riders he also likened them that are gathered from one side but scattered on the other.[4]

It is quite natural that such morale can on no accounts tolerate a calm and reformist ruler who resorts to human and logical ways. At the end, the more Imām insisted on people's unity against Damascus, the less they even tried to defend Iraq.

---

[1]. Nahdj al-balāgha, sermon 199

[2]. al-Irshād, vol.I, p.281 وما كنت متحرياً صلاحكم بفساد نفسي I sought not my ruin through thy reform.

[3]. Nahdj al-balāgha, sermon 70

[4]. al-Irshād, vol.I, p.283 يا اشباه الإبل غاب عنها رعاتها، كلما اجتمعت من جانب تفرقت من جوانب أخرى Thou look like camels left unharnessed by camel drivers, if they are gathered on one side, they shall be dispersed on the other side.

It was then when Imām addressed them reproaching, أيتها الفرقة التي إذا امرت لم تطع وإذا دعوت لم تجب، لله أنتم، أما دين يجمعكم، أما حمية تشخدكم؟ أوليس عجباً أنّ معاوية يدعو الجفاة الطغام فيتبعونه غير معونة ولا عطاء وأنا أدعوكم وأنتم تريكة الاسلام، أنه لايخرج إليكم من امري رضاً ترضونه ولا سُخط فتجتمعون عليه وإن احبَّ ما أنا لاق إلي الموت[1] "O the crowd laying disobedient when ordered and remaining silent when called. Thou hast no religion to prepare thee? Thou hast no fervor to propel thee? Not a surprise rogues follow Mu'āwiya without expecting money and he is obeyed. I call you, the survivors of Islam, but you never follow me even I am not outraged for this. The only desire I seek is death."

These people treat 'Alī such while having brilliant records as far as he desires death. Of course, Imām could attract people, like Mu'āwiya, through non-Islamic ways or force them to war. But Imām behaved them this way now that they like staying and he never intended to force them to accept something they did not want[2] because if he did so, his leadership is not "Imamate " but "Monarchy". This was something Mu'āwiya stayed proud of. Anyway, such people faced Ḥasan Ibn 'Alī (a)'s succession, the eople unwilling to admit their Imām's command to defend Iraq and they went their homse from Nahrawān for rest and never returned.[3] Mu'āwiya's position in Damascus had strengthened as well. Damascus people who had already called Mu'āwiya Amīr now called him Amīr al-Mu'minīn. The Iraqi solidarity was not like that of Ṣiffīn time. The death toll in Ṣiffīn and Nahrawān had undermined the Iraqi's spirit.[4] Since Ḥasan Ibn 'Alī was Imām 'Alī's son, it had added to the difficulties. Yet, Iraq was afraid of being dominated by Damascus. Although they disobeyed their Imām, they were not contended with his murder. In other words, because they did not want to be under Mu'āwiya's dominance, they had no other alternative but swearing allegiance to Imām 'Alī's son. Under those circumstances no one could lead Iraq but Imām Ḥasan (a). Supposing that he did not exist, the Umayyads would naturally rule over Iraq. Nevertheless, the Iraqis' allegiance was not so wholehearted to keep them faithful to their new Imām. As seen later, on the horns of a dilemma, they preferred to be beside the Umayyads, yet unwillingly. Therefore, among these people there was no room for Imām. He had to head for Medina.

---

[1]. Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, vol.X, p.67

[2]. Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, vol.XI, p.29 وقد أحببتم البقاء وليس لي أن أحملكم على ما تكرهون "Thou preferred to stay, so I have not the right to force thee to do something unpleasing to thee."

[3]. Ibid. vol.II, p.193; Murūdj al-dhahab, vol.II, p.418

[4]. Although the killed on Imām's side were a few, many Khāridjites who were killed were from Kūfa people's relatives.

IMĀM ḤASAN'S CHARACTER

Regarding Imām Ḥasan's virtues many narrations are recorded the narrators of which have been both Shi'ite Muslims and Sunnites scholars.[1] Many historical books have been written containing his virtues but regretfully until recently no serious effort had been made about the events in his life. Like any other time, the events are compiled with no serious research done nor is a detailed evaluation made. Most of the recorded virtues concerned with this magnanimous Imām reveal how much the two brothers were adored by Allāh's Apostle who expressed his affection even publicly. Coming down the pulpit, kissing them and then going up the pulpit indicated that there was a reason behind the scenes.[2] It is additionally quoted from the prophet that he advised the present to recount to the absentees how he expressed affection for Imām Ḥasan (a).[3]

He had also stated, "I do love him and the one loving him." [4]

Imām's presence in Mubāhala (cursing each other) and among the people of Kasā' (covering) shows the credit the prophet had considered for him. Appealingly, when Imām Mudjtabā (a) took part in Riḍwān allegiance, the Prophet swore allegiance to him.[5]

In a narration he has stated, لوكان العقل رجلاً لكان الحسن "If wisdom was imagined in a man, he would be Ḥasan."[6]

Imām Ḥasan's power in persuading the Kūfiyāns, when Nākithīn[7] revolted, manifests his importance and popularity among the people. As far as these hadiths are concerned, Muslims considered Fāṭima al-Zahrā's descendants as the Apostle's, and despite the Umayyads's and later the 'Abbāsids's denial there was no doubt for Muslims in this regard.[8]

---

1. Such as Tardjamat al-Ḥasan from Ibn 'Asākir in Tārikh Dimashq and Tardjamat al-imām al-Ḥasan from Ibn Sa'd in Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā

2. Nūr al-abṣār, pp.119-120, Manāqib Ibn Shahr Āshūb, vol.IV, p.24; Naẓm Durar al-simṭayn, p.195

3. al-Mustadrak, Ḥukaym Niyshābūrī, vol.III, pp.147, 173; al-Iṭḥāf bi-ḥubb al-ashrāf, p.34

4. Tardjamat al-imām al-Ḥasan (a), Ibn Sa'd, p.134

5. al-Ḥayāt al-siyāsiya li l-Imām al-Ḥasan, pp.24,44

6. Farā'id al-simṭayn, vol.II, p.68

7. Tardjamat al-imām al-Ḥasan, Ibn Sa'd, p.49

8. al-Ḥayāt al-siāsiyya Li-Imām al-Ḥasan, p.27. According to a narration in Kashf al-ghumma, vol.I, p.550, Mu'āwīya tried to call Ḥasan (a) and Ḥusayn (a) Imām 'Alī's sons not the Prophet's.

It was due to his eminent characteristic that when Imām ʻAlī introduced him publicly as his successor, the people of Iraq and other areas swore allegiance to him as an official caliph. Meanwhile, the spiteful around tried to mar his characteristic introducing him as the one with no policy and prudence on the one hand and a worldly figure with an opposite position to those of ʻAlī (a) and Ḥusayn (a) on the other hand. For example, with recourse to a handful of counterfeited reports they tried to rumor that Imām Mudjtabā (a) had been constantly marrying and divorcing.[1] Related to the reports of the compromise, they claimed that he abdicated through a number of financial conditions. It implies that he had been after Dārābdjird and Ahwāz revenues as well as the public found in Kūfa.[2]

In such reports they have declared that since Imām did not deem caliphate his right, he submitted it to Muʻāwiya. This utterance is nothing but an accusation because Imām had regularly made it clear that caliphate had been his right yet he had to give it up under duress.[3] In addition to blemishing his reputation mostly done by the ʻAbbāsids under the pressure of the Ḥasanides they abused Imām's position to condemn ʻAlī (a) and even Ḥusayn Ibn ʻAlī (a). They falsely quoted Imām as saying,"For the sake of kingdom, never will I fight Muʻāwiya".[4]

It could seem useful to Sunnites bigots to condemn Imām ʻAlī's wars. It is also narrated that when Imām Ḥasan was born, his father liked to name him Ḥarb (war)[5]. They implied that from the very beginning he did naturally love to fight.

Elsewhere they have quoted him as saying, "The entire Arab might is in my hand so it will be with me whether I fight or compromise.[6] One hundred thousand or forty thousand people swore allegiance to him and even loved him more than his father".[7] Anyone who believes such untrue remarks, he will inevitably assume that Imām left the authority of his own volition not by force. These two are worlds apart.

---

[1]. al-Itḥāf, p.34

[2]. It will be discussed later.

[3]. al-Amālī, Shiykh Ṭūsī, vol.II, p.172; Bahdj al-ṣabāqa, vol.III, p.448; Ḥayāt al-Ḥayawān, vol.I, p.58; Biḥār al-anwār, vol.XXXXIV, pp.30,56; Manāqib Ibn Shahr Āshūb, vol.IV, p.34

[4]. Dhakhā'ir al-ʻuqbā, p.139; Naẓm Durar al-simṭayn, p.195

[5]. Tardjamat al-imām al-Ḥasan, Ibn Saʻd, p.126

[6]. Ibid. p.167; Dhakhā'ir al-ʻuqbā, p.139

[7]. Tahdhīb al-tahdhīb, vol.II, p.299; Dhakhā'ir al-ʻuqbā, ,pp.138-139; Tahdhīb Tārīkh Dimashq, vol.IV, p.212; al-Itḥāf, p.35

The other point was that this group of historians had been determined to prove in their historical reports that the two brothers had been in discord with different attitudes. In a narration they have quoted the Prophet as saying, "Ḥasan is from me but Ḥusayn from 'Alī".[1]

Whereas as one of Imām Ḥusayn's virtues repeated over and over is, حسين مني وانا من حسين "Ḥusayn is from me and I am from Ḥusayn."

Why this narration was counterfeited is to introduce 'Alī and his son, Ḥusayn, both as the seekers of murder.

Concerning the differences between the two brothers, they have quoted Imām Ḥusayn as saying to his brother, "I wish my heart were yours and your tongue mine".[2] They have also quoted Abū Bakr, upon seeing Ḥasan Ibn 'Alī, as saying, بابي شبيه بالنبي ليس شبيها بعلي[3] "By my father, he looks more like the Prophet than 'Alī."

These are all narrated as virtue by the later generations while they had been counterfeited with the mentioned aim. Such a view could help the 'Uthmānids to damage Imām 'Alī's reputation and 'Āshūrā.

One of the accusations made against Imām was his 'Uthmānids stance, that is to say that he had been at odds with his father and refused to bloodshed in civil wars.

Misunderstanding the concept of compromise counted for the accusation. It was falsely claimed that although powerful enough, Imām relinquished authority to Mu'āwiya. But an unfounded accusation it is nothing. It was maintained to the extent that they narrated that he had accused his father of participating in 'Uthmān's assassination.[4]

Earlier it was discussed that no one but the Umayyads with political intention accused Imām 'Alī of being an accomplice in 'Uthmān's murder. By the same token how can it be ever possible for his son to accuse him of so? Surprisingly, a group of historians have said that Imām had sent his son to 'Uthmān's house to defend him. Given that it is true,[5] he had been set to prevent him from being killed. Furthermore, Imām Ḥasan had been among the participants in Djamal war who played pivotal roles against the 'Uthmānidses. Imām 'Alī's representative to persuade the Kūfiyāns to take

---

[1]. Dhakhā'ir al-'uqbā, p.132

[2]. Kashf al-ghumma, vol.II, p.243; Tardjamat al-imām al-Ḥusayn. Ibn 'Asākir, pp.145-146

[3]. Manāqib Ibn Shahr Āshūb, vol.IV, p.121

[4]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.II,p.12. According to this narration, Ḥasan has objected to Imām 'Alī (a). It is true but this Ḥasan had been Ḥasan Baṣrī not Imām Mudjtabā.

[5]. Professor Sayyid Dja'far Murtaḍā is skeptical of this issue. al-Ḥayāt al-siyāsiya li l-Imām al-Ḥasan, pp.149-150

part in war was he who could persuade some ten thousand people into the anti-'Uthmānid war with his sermon in Kūfa mosque.[1] Prior to that, he had defended Abūdhar when in dispute with 'Uthmān and when parting Abūdhar at the time of being sent into exile he told him,"Put up with the difficulties they have made to you until you visit Allāh's Apostle while satisfied with you"[2] In the thick of Ṣiffīn war 'Ubayd Allāh, 'Umar's son, who had killed Hurmuzān, his wife and his Abū Lu'lu' scared of Imām 'Alī's retaliation tried foolishly in vain to have Imām Ḥasan stand against his father. It was after he rejected him angrily that Mu'āwiya said, "He is indeed his father's son".[3]

In Ṣiffīn, Imām Mudjtabā (a) provoked people against Qāsiṭīn. Once he had addressed them, فاحتشدوا في قتال عدّوكم معاوية وجنوده فإنه قد حضر ولاتخاذلوا فإن الخذلان يقطع نياط القلوب[4] "Unite against your enemy, Mu'āwiya and his army, and never droop for it does sever the nerves of your heart."

He also, in a letter written to Mu'āwiya at the beginning of his term, alluded to Ahl al-Bayt's rightfulness and oppressedness after the Prophet's departure. These are all convincing reasons for confirming what a great helper Imām had been to his father Under any circumstances.

In a narration when Imām Mudjtabā saw Abū Bakr on the pulpit he said, إنزل عن منبر أبي "Climb down my father's pulpit!"

Immediately Imām 'Alī (a) said,إن هذا شيء عن غير ملاء منا[5]"This is something exceptional in our tribe."

Imām Ḥasan's strong position in fighting against Mu'āwiya after assuming the caliphate was exactly like that of his father. Imām's hostility towards the Umayyads was to the extent that Marwān did not allow his corpse to be buried next to the Prophet's grave, saying,"Why 'Uthmān was buried outside Baqī' but Ḥasan Ibn 'Alī next to the Prophet?"[6] It does manifest how strong had been Imām Mudjtabā's position against 'Uthmānids's attitude. Yet, as mentioned earlier regarding the issue of

---

[1]. Waq'at Ṣiffīn, p.15; al-'Iqd al-farīd, vol.V, p.63

[2]. al-Ḥayāt al-siyāsiya li l-Imām al-Ḥasan (a), p.113; Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, vol.VIII, p.253; al-Ghadīr, vol.VIII, p.301; Tārīkh al-ya'qūbī, vol.II, p.172

[3]. Waq'at Ṣiffīn, p.297; Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, vol.V, p.233; Manāqib, Ibn Shahr Āshūb, vol.III, pp.186,199

[4]. Waq'at Ṣiffīn, p.114

[5]. Tardjamat al-imām al-Ḥasan, Ibn Sa'd, p.160; Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.II, p.26; Ibn Sa'd(219) has referred to such a reaction by Imām Ḥusayn (a).

[6]. Naẓm Durar al-simṭayn, p.205; Rawḍa al-Wā'iẓīn, p.168; Manāqib, Ibn Shahr Āshūb, vol.IV, p.44; Dhakhā'ir al-'uqbā, p.142

compromise and in order to legitimize Mu'āwiya's rule, Imām's position was distorted.

IMĀM MUDJTABĀ AND IMAMATE

The trace of the 'Uthmānids's attitude in Sunnism proves that Imām Mudjtabā's six-month caliphate was neglected considered neither as the Orthodox caliphs' term nor as the monarch's.[1] In other words, his caliphate was not that legitimate. The survivors of Muhādjirūn and Anṣār in Kūfa, yet along with the people of Iraq and the oriental lands of Islam had acquiesced to him as Muslim's caliph. Meanwhile Mu'āwiya had also claimed caliphate in Damascus though according to himself only one from among Anṣār had joined him, hence a wide gap was created among Muslims.[2] It was evident that not only the principle of analyzing caliphate was not accepted at that time but also to the end of the historical caliphate era it was assumed impossible to exist two caliphs simultaneously in the Islamic world. The present situation of Iraq when Imām Ḥasan(a) assumed the power was far worse than that of Damascus. In addition to the defeat the Iraqi people had experienced concerning arbitration, the Khāridjites's revolt did severely undermine their morale and after three wars had gone weary. In very last days of his life, the more Imām 'Alī tried to mobilize them, the less they obeyed.[3] Now after Imām 'Alī's martyrdom and the Iraqi people's concern about Damascus domination, it looked probable that they resist. They should have chosen an Imām and as referred to previously, they had no other alternative. Qays Ibn Sa'd's and 'Abd Allāh Ibn 'Abbās's allegiance to Imām paved the way for the Iraqis's allegiance. Following them, the residents of Ḥidjāz after a while of delay swore allegiance.

Among the people the Shi'ite Muslims were found whose belief was profoundly in Imām Mudjtabā's Imamate and whose sworn allegiance was based on it as well. As a matter of fact, the tendency of the majority in Kūfa was towards Shi'ism, namely denying 'Uthmān and approving 'Alī (a). They, during Imām's five-year term, being influenced by Imām and his disciples had become 'Alawites and hated the 'Uthmānids. Opposition to 'Uthmān as well as his infamy in the city from the very time of Imām 'Alī

---

[1]. In historical books it is mentioned that after Imām 'Alī's martyrdom he took power with the allegiance of those present in Kūfa. In Tārikh al-khulafā', Suyūṭī, Mas'ūdī has said that considering Imām Ḥasan's caliphate the narration of الخلافة بعدي ثلاثون سنة "The caliphate after me is thirty years" Would be right as seen in some historical books. Later, he referring to the duration of each caliph had confirmed the caliphate until the early third century.

[2]. Ṭabaqāt al-shu'arā', p.109; al-Imtā' wa l-Mu'ānisa, vol.III, p.170

[3]. Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, vol.X, p.67

(a) was to the extent that Djarīr Ibn 'Abd Allāh Badjalī had said that he would no longer stay where 'Uthmān was officially insulted.[1] Whom could people choose other than Imām Mudjtabā after 'Alī's martyrdom? Among Muhādjirūn and Anṣār or even the Qurayshites, of course, there were a group of the Prophet's disciples such as 'Abd Allāh Ibn 'Abbās in Kūfa who without a shadow of doubt had faith in Imām Mudjtabā and never ever did they think of someone else. The meaning was not that the Iraqi people liked Ḥasan Ibn 'Alī more than his father,[2] it was owing to the fact that there was no other choice. It is pointed out because some are set to declare that the convenient opportunity was provided to Imām Ḥasan but he himself declined to keep on his struggle.

As far as the theory of Shi'ites Imamate is concerned, there is evidence that Imām 'Alī had introduced his son as his successor though the Sunnis have not referred to such evidence for succession.[3] A narration is quoted from the Prophet in this respect in many a source as stating, الحسن والحسين امامان، قاما أو قعدا [4] "Ḥasan and Ḥusayn are the Imāms whether they rise up or not."

This Hadith makes it clear that the two brothers' Imamate had been expressly stated. Historically, there are reports as proofs of Imām Mudjtabā's Imamate.

As reported by Naṣr Ibn Muzāḥim, A'war Shannī had addressed Imām 'Alī (a), "May Allāh endow you more with success for a glance you have cast at divine light... The leader is you. Were you killed, the leaders would be these two, Ḥasan and Ḥusayn. Lend an ear to what I have composed, "O Ḥasan's father! The dazzling sun of the midday is you and the shining moon is your sons. Until the Day of Judgement, thou and these two will go together as an ear with an eye. The generous are thou whose generosity is so sublime that no man can keep up with.[5]

Mundhir Ibn Ya'mur told Imām in Ṣiffīn, فان قتلك فهذان الحسن والحسين أئمتنا من بعدك "Ḥasan and Ḥusayn would be our Imāms after you even if you were killed."

In a poem he had composed,

ابا حسن أنت شمس النهار وهذان في الداجيات القمر
وأنت وهذان حتي الممات بمنـــزلة السمع بعد البصر[6]

---

[1]. Mukhtaṣar Tārīkh Dimashq, vol.VI, p.30; vol.VII, p.282

[2]. Tardjamat al-imām al-Ḥasan, Ibn 'Asākir, p.171

[3]. Maqtal Amīr al-Mu'minīn, p.61, Ibn Abi l-Dunyā has said that no successor 'Alī introduced.

[4]. Madjma' al-bayān, vol.II, p. 403; Kashf al-ghumma, vol.II, p.159; al-Irshād, p.220

[5]. Waq'at Ṣiffīn, pp.424-425 (Ṣiffīn Battle, p.580); Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā, vol.III, p.34

[6]. al-Futūḥ, vol.III, p.147

O Ḥasan's father, the midday sun dazzling is thee and the shining moon is these two. Until the Day of Judgement thou and these two will go together as an ear with an eye

It clarifies that Imām's disciples even from his time knew both Imām Ḥasan and Imām Ḥusayn as his successors as after Imām Mudjtabā's martyrdom Kūfiyān Shi'ite Muslims went after Imām Ḥusayn (a). 'Abd Allāh Ibn 'Abbās also called the people to listen to Imām Mudjtabā who said, "Swear allegiance to him who is your Prophet's son and your Imām's successor".[1]

In a letter, Imām Mudjtabā also wrote to Mu'āwiya "On the threshold of demise, my father entrusted the power to me."[2]

Haytham Ibn 'Adī has quoted his chiefs as saying, "Ḥasan Ibn 'Alī is his father's successor".[3] When Abu l-Aswad Du'alī secured allegiance for Imām in Baṣra, said that, "Successorship and Imamate " had been entrusted to him by his father."[4]

People also told Imām, "You are our caliph and your father's successor and we are you followers".[5]

Anyhow it can be borne in mind that Imām 'Alī (a) had introduced his son as his successor.[6] One Friday when Imām did not feel fine, he asked Ḥasan to lead the Prayer.[7] Heedless of the fact that Kūfa Shi'ite Muslims had come up with Imām Mudjtabā based on their beliefs, the special Shi'ites concepts of Ahl al-Bayt and the dignity of Imām should be taken into account.

Imām's first-ever sermon as reported by all related sources is, "Anyone who knows me, all right but anyone who does not know me, I am Ḥasan, Muḥammad's son. The son of the Bearer of good news and the Warner is I. I am the son of Allāh's Apostle and with His permission the guidance light. I am from among Ahl al-Bayt from whom any filth and sin is kept away;

---

[1]. al-Irshād, vol.II, p.8. In a book by Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, vol.I6, pp.30-31 and Maqātil al-ṭālibiyyīn, p.33 the word of successor is not referred to.

[2]. al-Futūḥ, vol.IV, p.151;(in Maqātil al-ṭālibiyyīn, Iṣfahānī, p.36 and) Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, vol.I6, p.24, it is narrated, و لاني المسلمون الامر من بعده "After him, I am Muslims' leader" The difference between the two is clear.

[3]. al-'Iqd al-farīd, vol.IV, p.474

[4]. al-Aghānī, vol.I1, p.116

[5]. Biḥār al-anwār, vol.IV4, p.43

[6]. al-Ḥayāt al-Siyāsiyya li l-Imām al-Ḥasan, pp.48-49

[7]. Murūdj al-dhahab, vol.II, p.431

whom are purified and whose affection Allāh has made incumbent upon you in His Book, say, for my mission I want thee naught but affection for my kinsfolk's.[1] And (anyone who does good, we do multiply his good), so this good is feeling affection for us, Ahl al-Bayt."[2]

Mas'ūdī has presented a part of Imām Ḥasan's one sermon as follows, "The saved Allāh's party and close kin's of Allāh's Apostle are we. We are the purified ones and one of the two weighty things left behind by the prophet. The other one is the divine Book to which no wrong can ever penetrate ... Obey us then, for our obedience is incumbent, for besides obeying Allāh and His Apostle about the men of authorities it is ordered too. Anything which was in dispute, refer to Allāh and His Apostle... If you referred to the Apostle and the authorities, they would surely figure it out, for they are the people of science inference".[3]

Hilāl Ibn Yasāf has recounted that he was present when Ḥasan Ibn 'Alī delivered a sermon saying,

"O Kūfiyāns! Fear from Allāh concerning us. We are your emirs and your guests. We are the ones about whom Allāh has stated, انما يريد الله ليذهب عنكم الرجس البيت ويطهركم تطهيرا[4] "Allāh only desires to keep away the uncleanness from you, O people of the House! And to give you a thorough purifying."

This sermon appears to be made after Imām Ḥasan was wounded in Sābāṭ.

In spite of Muhādjirūn's and Anṣār's allegiance to the former caliphs, Imām Mudjtabā like his father deemed caliphate his right. His letter to Mu'āwiya like that of Imām 'Alī (a) included censure for the former caliphs' designation. Pointing to Quraysh's reasoning in Saqīfa, kinship to the Prophet (s) and Arabs' approval of such reasoning, Imām in his letter wrote,"Although such reasoning we also had, Quraysh never behaved justly towards us as were behaved by Arabs. They altogether oppressed us and stood against us. Since we feared from the hypocrites and the parties, we had to bear them until we now come to grips with you who have no precedence in Islam and whose father had been the archenemy of Allāh's Apostle and Book". Then Imām urged him to swear allegiance to him like people.

---

[1]. It is the first part of the verse to the last part which only was referred in the narration.

[2]. Maqātil al-ṭālibiyyīn, p.33; Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, vol.XVI, pp.30-31; Tardjamat al-imām al-Ḥasan, Ibn Sa'd, p.167; Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.III, p.28; Ḥayāt al-ṣaḥāba, vol.III, pp.526-527

[3]. Murūdj al-dhahab, Vol.II, p.432. (The Women, 83)

[4]. Tardjamat al-imām al-Ḥasan (a), Ibn Sa'd, p.167

In his response, Mu'āwiya referred to his reaction against the event of Saqīfa and wrote, "So you explicitly have denounced not only Abū Bakr, 'Umar and Abū 'Ubayda but Muhādjirūn and Anṣār. We never deny your virtues and precedence. That day they preferred them to you for protecting Islam. Today the discord between you and me is the same as that between Abū Bakr and you after the Prophet's departure. If I were certain that you were better than me as a lord of peasants and supporter of the nation or stronger than me in collecting properties and in encountering the enemies, I would swear allegiance to you. Since I am more experienced in ruling and older than you, you had better concede my sovereignty. If you do so, I will entrust the authority to you after myself, grant you a great quantity from Iraqi Bayt al-Māl (Public fund) and the revenues of anywhere you demanded in Iraq."[1]

The mention Mu'āwiya had made about the similarity between his dispute with 'Alī and his son and that of Abū Bakr and 'Alī was also seen in the letters exchanged between Muḥammad Ibn Abī Bakr and Mu'āwiya.[2]

Considering himself as the successor of Abū Bakr and 'Umar, Mu'āwiya insisted on it for he was pursuing a political intention as well.

Once he had written to Imām 'Alī (a),"You did injustice to the caliphs all".

If I did so, answered Imām, I should not apologize to you. The latter added,"I never did injustice. Only did I blame them and for what I did I will apologize to no one."[3]

For whatever reason the people of Iraq and Ḥidjāz swore allegiance to Imām Ḥasan. It is said that when swearing allegiance, Qays Ibn Sa'd said, "For the sake of the Holy Book, the prophet's Sunna and Djihād against the oppressors I do swear allegiance to you."

Imām only preferred the first and the second ones saying, "These two are superior".[4] As recounted by Madā'inī after Imām 'Alī (a) died a martyr Ibn 'Abbās left home and cried out "One it left behind 'Alī (a) if willing, invite him to come out and you swear allegiance to him but if unwilling no one forces you". While they were weeping for Imām 'Alī (a), people showed satisfaction. Imām stepped out of home and after delivering a sermon and reciting the verse of Taṭhīr (purification) and the crowd swore allegiance to

---

[1]. Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, vol.XVI, pp.33-36 (simplified); al-Futūḥ, vol.IV, pp.151-153; Maqātil al-ṭālibiyyīn, pp.64-68

[2]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.II, p.31 Mu'āwīya wrote to Muḥammad Ibn Abū Bakr "You father and I knew well that 'Alī was superior but after the Prophet passed away", فكان أبوك وفاروقه أوّل من ابتزّ حقّه وخالفه على أمره "Your father and his horrible friend were the first ones who usurped his right and opposed him" Murūdj al-dhahab, vol.III, pp.11-13

[3]. Nahdj al-balāgha, letter 28

[4]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.V, p.158

him.[1] Later on Imām had addressed them, "Of your own volition you swore allegiance to me not under duress".[2]

According to what Iṣfahānī has narrated, when Ibn 'Abbās called on the crowd to swear allegiance to him they announced that they knew no other one to be lovelier and more rightful than him, they announced that they knew no other one to be lovelier and more rightful than him, thus, they swore.[3]

Another point which merits to be taken into account is that the political principle agreed on caliphate is the allegiance of both Mecca and Medina. At the moment after about thirty years after the Prophet's departure, the majority of Prophet's disciples have been killed in conquests and also in Djamal and Ṣiffīn. Medina was no longer the center of caliphate. Therefore, the above-mentioned principle that was the allegiance of Muhādjirūn and Anṣār residing in Medina was called in to two questions. The problem per se foreboded how the situation was converted. It will be discussed later that the principle was not only dissolved but also substituted by the principle of succession on the part of Mu'āwiya. In addition, from among the chiefs of Quraysh a few survived to claim caliphate.

In a letter Mu'āwiya had written to Ibn 'Abbās, "Now you have to be concerned about Quraysh! Only six are alive, two in Damascus namely 'Amr Ibn 'Āṣ and I, two in Ḥidjāz, Sa'd Ibn Abī Waqqāṣ and 'Abd Allāh Ibn 'Umar and two in Iraq, you and Ḥasan Ibn 'Alī".[4]

Under such circumstances, Iraq could only trust Imām 'Alī's son. However there was a problem due to which the Iraqis were not able to be firm in their chosen way. When swearing allegiance to Imām a group was set to swear provided that Imām did battle with Mu'āwiya. Imām Mudjtabā by no means approved their condition and said that he would not accept their allegiance unless they vowed to battle against anyone he battled and compromise with anyone he compromised.[5] It seems quite natural that no leader can swear allegiance under such a condition. He ought to be fully empowered to battle or compromise. Imām's remark never implies that form the very beginning he was not intent on war[6], but his next actions showed that he was among the ones who insisted on war. The main reason for

---

[1]. Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, vol.XVI, pp.22, 28

[2]. al-Futūḥ, vol.IV, p.156

[3]. Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, vol.XVI, p.31

[4]. al-Imāma wa l-siyāsa, vol.I, p.133; Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.IV, p.105, No.315

[5]. Tardjamat al-imām al-Ḥasan, Ibn Sa'd, pp 154-155; Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.V, p.158; Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.III, p.29

[6]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.III, p.29

rejecting this condition was preserving his sovereignty as Imām of a community. If the condition had been approved, they indeed must have chosen a military commander not an Imām.

Shiykh Mufīd has recorded that Imām was sworn allegiance on Friday Ramaḍān 21st, 40.[1]

FIRST ACTIONS OF IMĀM AND MU'ĀWIYA

Earlier we referred to one of Imām's letters to Mu'āwiya and its answer. The exchanged letters recorded by Iṣfahānī[2] bore no fruit. Imām himself was absolutely aware that would never surrender with such letters, yet, it is of great significance that these letters be recorded as evidence to indicate explicitly what the reasoning of the both sides were for their legitimacy.

Mu'āwiya did his utmost to be kept abreast of the state in Kūfa and Baṣra through his spies. But the spies were all identified and killed.[3] Both Imām and 'Abd Allāh Ibn 'Abbās had written to Mu'āwiya admonishing him for his violation. For the last time Imām warned Mu'āwiya if he did not surrender, he with the Muslim army would attack, فحاكمتك الى الله حتى يحكم الله بيننا وبينكم وهو خير الحاكمين[4] "We entrust the arbitration between you and me to Allāh to judge and He is the best arbitrator."

When writing letters was fruitless, Imām wrote to Mu'āwiya, "Between you and I, sword will judge".[5]

In a letter, then, to his agents in various areas besides expressing his delight in Imām 'Alī's effortless murder, Mu'āwiya informed them of Kūfa in chaos. "The nobles and the leaders in Kūfa have written to me for guarantee of clemency for themselves and their families", added he truly or falsely, "as soon as you receive the letter, move to me with your armies because time is ripe for revenge". Accompanied by his army Mu'āwiya advanced towards Manbadj bridge. At the same time, Imām Ḥasan (a) sent Ḥudjr Ibn 'Adī for people and his agents to get prepared for fighting.

In Kūfa Imām after reciting the verse of, واصبروا ان الله مع الصابرين[6] "And be patient; surely Allāh is with the patient," addressed the gathering, "O people, but through patience with what you dislike. You can never reach what you

---

[1]. al-Irshād, vol.II, p.9

[2]. Maqātil al-ṭālibiyyīn, pp.62-68

[3]. Ibid. p.62; Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, vol.XVI, p.31; al-Irshād, vol.II, p.9

[4]. Maqātil al-ṭālibiyyīn, p.66

[5]. Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, vol.XVI, p.26

[6]. 'Anfāl, p 46

like. I learnt that Mu'āwiya is moving towards us. Hasten to Nukhayla you all".[1] Iṣfahānī recounts that Imām was speaking as if doubtful about people's readiness. No one breathed a word.

All of a sudden 'Adī Ibn Ḥātim broke the silence saying, "I am Ḥātim's son. Why on earth do you keep waiting? Do you not obey your Imām and your Prophet's son?" Then he assured Imām and headed for Nukhayla. A number of people from the tribe of Ṭayy whose chief was 'Adī Ibn Ḥātim accompanied him. According to Ya'qūbī, there were a hundred fighters in Ṭayy who never dared to disobey 'Adī.[2] Later, Qays Ibn Sa'd, Ma'qal Ibn Qays and Ziyād Ibn Ṣa'ṣa'a gave speeches; therefore, around twelve thousand soldiers gathered in Nukhayla. Imām accompanied them up to 'Abd al-Raḥmān Convent.[3]

It should not be ignored that the Iraqis' morale had been undermined after the event of arbitration. They had prepared themselves for a compromise with Qāsiṭīn. On the other hand, whenever they imagined to be dominated by Mu'āwiya, their hair stood on end. At this juncture, a group feigned ignorance, another group was quite doubtful and only one group, the minority, joined Imām. Setting out for the camp, Imām left his paternal cousin, Mughīra Ibn Nawfal, in Kūfa to convince people to join. Ḥārith Hamdānī has said that those willing to join Imām went to Nukhayla while many balked at going among whom some had already promised to cooperate.[4] As a result, Imām had to return to Kūfa and mobilize support.

Imām's such position-taking is despite what Zuhrī and others have said, كان الحسن لايؤثر القتال ويميل إلى حقن الدماء[5] "Ḥasan is as a matter of fact reluctant to battle." ولم يكن في نية الحسن أن يقاتل أحداً ولكن غلبوه على رأيه[6] "Since Ḥasan was not determined to battle, he compromised."

In addition, Imām had given people raises in order to strengthen their spirit.[7] They got the raise form the very beginning of caliphate to get ready for the war against Damascus.

The total number gathered in Nukhayla was twelve thousand. They had to go there following their chiefs and under the pressure of propaganda. Though this figure is stipulated in many historical sources, some believe that it was forty thousand. It is said that the troops with Imām going to 'Abd al-

---

[1]. Maqātil al-ṭālibiyyīn, p.69

[2]. Tārīkh al-ya'qūbī, vol.II, p.181

[3]. Maqātil al-ṭālibiyyīn, pp.70-71

[4]. Biḥār al-anwār, vol.XXXXIV, p.44

[5]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.V, p.158; Tadhkirat al-khawāṣ, p.196

[6]. al-Bidāya wa l-nihāya, vol.VIII, p.14

[7]. Maqātil al-ṭālibiyyīn, p.64

Raḥmān Convent had been forty thousand form among whom a thousand were sent as the vanguard led by Qays Ibn Sa'd.[1] This mentioned figure can by no means be correct because, the historical narrations certify that all at first remained silent when called. How is it possible that the number augmented suddenly and miraculously? If Imām's supporters were that many, there would be no need to go to Ctesiphon and summon forces nor to risk and leave the army all on its own. Many historians such as Ya'qūbī, Abu l-Faradj Iṣfahānī and Ibn 'Asākir who have accurately recorded the report have approved the twelve-thousand figure. [2] There is a strong probability that this false narration refers to those who swore allegiance to him after Imām 'Alī's martyrdom. The number mentioned in that narration is forty thousand who were supposed to battle with Damascus.[3] According to some[4], this narration had made a group of people assume that this great number had been prepared to aid Ḥasan Ibn 'Alī (a) although the allegiance of this number to Imām 'Alī (a) is open to doubt by itself. Regarding Imām 'Alī's repeated remarks in Nahdj al-Balāgha and other sources about reproaching Kufa people for not helping him in the war against Damascus, it beggars belief that such a large crowd help his son. As it will be seen later the main cause for the compromise was people's non-collaboration. Which can be easily inferred from Imām's remarks. It is clear-cut that with the presence of forty thousand soliers such rematks should not have been quoted from him.

'Ubayd Allāh Ibn 'Abbās was the commander of Imām's army but Zuhrī has mistakenly named 'Abd Allāh Ibn 'Abbās.[5] Some others have mentioned Qays Ibn Sa'd,[6] after 'Ubayd Allāh fled, who seized his position. There is no doubt that Imām had appointed 'Ubayd Allāh.[7] Why Imām chose him was that in the present situation full of doubt Imām had no other choice but appointing one form his own lineage. Moreover, 'Ubayd Allāh bore Mu'āwiya a grudge because Busr Ibn Arṭāt, one of Mu'āwiya's commanders, in an attack on Ḥidjāz had beheaded his two sons before their mother's very eyes. Yet, Imām treated it with caution and appointed two deputies for him, Qays Ibn Sa'd and Sa'īd Ibn Qays.

---

[1]. al-Futūḥ, vol.IV, p.153; al-Kāmil fi l-tārīkh, vol.III, p.61

[2]. Maqātil al-ṭālibiyyīn, p.71; Tārīkh al-ya'qūbī, vol.II, p.214; Tardjamat al-imām al-Ḥasan, Ibn 'Asākir, p.167

[3]. Dhakhā'ir al-'uqbā, pp.138-139

[4]. Ṣulḥ al-Ḥasan, Āl Yāsīn, p.123

[5]. Tardjamat al-imām al-Ḥasan, Ibn Sa'd, p.168

[6]. Tardjamat al-imām al-Ḥasan, Ibn 'Asākir, p.176

[7]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.III, p.34

Sending them towards the enemy, Imām headed for Sābāṭ in Ctesiphon. But before they go, he gave 'Ubayd Allāh some advice, ألن جانبك "Behave softly" ابسط ووجهك "Try to look cheerful" أفرش لهم جناحك "Cast the umbrella of your affection over them." ادنهم من مجلسك "Try to keep close to them" وشاور هذين "Consult these two" فلا تقاتله حتى يقتلك "Never start battling before being stated."

Imām also pointed out that those people were the survivors of the ones whom Imām 'Alī (a) trusted. Then Imām added that they should move to the Euphrates and then to Maskan to defend themselves against Mu'āwiya and stay there until being ordered.[1]

Imām himself went to Sābāṭ. As recorded by Dīnwarī, Mu'āwiya sent an army with 'Abd Allāh Ibn 'Āmir Ibn Kurayz to Anbār and then to Ctesiphon. Comprehending the situation, Imām had to set out to Ctesiphon.[2] The incident occurred there and is reported by all historians, was the Khāridjites attack on Imām. Such historians as Dīnwarī, Balādhurī, Abu l-Faradj Iṣfahānī and even Shiykh Mufīd quoting Iṣfahānī have said that form Imām's remarks the probalility of compromise could be inferred. Due to this reason the Khāridjites attacked him. It can not be acceptable. How could Imām, who had gone to Ctesiphon prevent the enemy's invasion or recruit people, give such utterances with the implicit aim of compromise before the war be started? Ya'qūbī has recounted clearly what happened. Mu'āwiya who never ever gave up trickery sent Mughīra Ibn Shu'ba and 'Abd Allāh Ibn 'Āmir to Sābāṭ to talk to Imām about compromise. When returning disppointedly in order to provoke the Khāridjites and under their breath in a way to be heard, they said, "Allāh indeed prevented blood shedding and suppressed the sedition by the Prophet's son. At last he accepted to compromise". Ya'qūbī added that it was then that on heating, the army grew furious and never doubted their truthfulness, so they attacked Ḥasan (a) and plundered what he possessed.[3] The Shi'ite Muslims protected Imām in the middle and kept him away. Meanwhile Djarrāḥ Ibn Sanān shouting,

"Like your father you have become polytheist" struck Imām on his thigh. Shi'ite Muslims attacked Djarrāḥ and killed him. Imām then had to take a rest in the house of Sābāṭ governor, Sa'd Ibn Mas'ūd Thaqafī who was Mukhtār's paternal uncle, for treatment.[4] Ya'qūbī's narration of the riot in Ctesiphon uncovered the fact that event was also plotted by Mu'āwiya and his commonders, specially, Mughīra Ibn Shu'ba, a corrupt man.

---

[1]. Maqātil al-ṭālibiyyīn, p.71; Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, vol.XVI, p.40

[2]. Akhbār al-ṭiwāl, p.216

[3]. Tārikh al-ya'qūbī, vol.II, p.215

[4]. Maqātil al-ṭālibiyyīn, p.72

After Imām was wounded, he addressed people, اتقوا الله فينا، فانا أمراؤكم وضفيانكم، أهل البيت الذين قال الله, إنما يُريدُ الله ليذهبَ عَنكُمُ الرّجسَ أهلَ البيت ويطهّركُم تطهيراً "Seek divine behavior towards us for we are the best rulers among you, that is the same Household about whom God said, "Verily God hast the will to purge evils off thee in thy purity."

The narrator says,"The listeners were all weeping".[1]

Imām's separation from the army for mobilizing forces and preparing Ctesiphon to avert the entrance of Damascus plunderers, created particular problems. The two armies stood against each other in Ḥabūbiyya village of Maskan. Mu'āwiya as usual had recourse to trickery to delude the rival army. He sent 'Abd al-Raḥmān Ibn Samura to falsely inform 'Ubayd Allāh and his army of Imām Ḥasan's demand for compromise. People, nevertheless, denied and cursed him.[2]

Later, he secretly sent one to give a message to 'Ubayd Allāh Ibn 'Abbās, "Ḥasan has requested us to compromise. If you join us, I will pay you a million dhms. You take the half now and the other half when we entered Kūfa." While people waited for 'Ubayd Allāh to come for the Dawn Prayer, he had nightly joined Mu'āwiya. Qays Ibn Sa'd led the prayer and then talked behind 'Abbās how he had assisted the unbelievers in Badr until he was arrested. Then he talked behind 'Ubayd Allāh how in Yemen he fled and let Busr Ibn Arṭāt murder his sons.[3]

Suggesting bribery on the part of Mu'āwiya and other reports reveal well that Mu'āwiya had under false pretences propounded the request for compromise on behalf of Imām. If, as a matter of fact, Imām had accepted the compromise, there would have been no need for Mu'āwiya to pay a million dhms to 'Ubayd Allāh. Most Iraqis were on the qui vive to see Imām's tendency towards compromising and immediately leave the army. As soon as 'Ubayd Allāh left, about two thirds of the army joined Mu'āwiya[4]; therefore, four thousand people remained with Qays Ibn Sa'd.

Mu'āwiya supposed that after 'Ubayd Allāh and a part of his army sought refuge no one had remained. When he sent Busr Ibn Arṭāt to the Iraqi army, they attacked him. He had to return and with an army attack them. Once again Qays and the army resisted and made them withdraw. A number were killed in the clash.[5] Mu'āwiya tried to deceive Qays as well, but Qyas

---

[1]. Tardjamat al-imām al-Ḥasan, Ibn Sa'd, pp.167,169,170; al-Mu'djam al-Kabīr, Vol.III, p.96, No.2761; Madjma' al-Zawā'id, vol.VI, p.167

[2]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.III, p. 37

[3]. Maqātil al-ṭālibiyyin, p. 73

[4]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.III, p. 38

[5]. Ibid, vol III, p.38

said about his religion he would never be deceived. Belittling him, Mu'āwiya called him a Jew the son of a Jew and said, "Look how your tribe left your father alone as he breathed his last on his own in Ḥawrān of Damascus."

In his answer Qays called him an idol the son of an idol and wrote,

"From the very beginning you unwillingly embraced Islam and you did nothing for it but sowing the seeds of discord and then willingly you deviated from it. You have always been in battle with Allāh and His Apostle and a party from the polytheist parties."[1] Iṣfahānī after recounting the event has referred to a delegation sent by Mu'āwiya to Sābāṭ for talks with Imām Ḥasan. It indicates that Mu'āwiya's aim for taking the former action had been only deceiving 'Ubayd Allāh.

Before the Iraqis were informed of Imām's injury, the spies had informed Mu'āwiya. Upon hearing the news, he wrote to Qays that his defiance was futile, for Ḥasan's disciples had revolted and wounded him Sābāṭ. It made Qays to wait for a message from Imām.[2] When the noble in Iraq realized that the victory would probably be Mu'āwiya's, they one after another either joined him or sent him the message of allegiance. According to Balādhurī the distinguished figures of Iraq went to Mu'āwiya and swore allegiance the first of whom was Khālid Ibn Ma'mar. He said that his allegiance was equal to those of Rabi'a tribe.

Later on, a poet had composed for Mu'āwiya,"Hold Khālid Ibn Ma'mar in esteem for without him you would never secured the authority".[3]

The policy that Mu'āwiya manipulated was spreading rumors in three areas of Kūfa, Sābāṭ and the war field. The Kūfiyāns thought that everything was over. In the war field it was said that your Imām had demanded to compromise. And in Sābāṭ Imām was said that 'Ubayd Allāh along with a majority had joined the enemy and it was even rumored that Qays Ibn Sa'd also had compromised. The only historian who has taken these multi-lateral rumors into consideration is Ya'qūbī.

He has said, "On one hand, Mu'āwiya sent a group to Imām's military camp to report that Qays Ibn Sa'd has compromised. On the other hand, he sent another group to rumor among Qays's troops that Ḥasan (a) has requested to compromise".[4] Regretfully, a number of historians have recorded such rumors as historical reports. As an instance, Muḥammad Ibn Sa'd has recorded Mughīra Ibn Shu'ba's trickery which led to the revolt of

---

[1]. Maqātil al-ṭālibiyyīn, p. 74; Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol. III, pp. 39-40

[2]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.III, p.38

[3]. Ibid. vol. III, p. 39

[4]. Tārīkh al-ya'qūbī, vol.II, p. 215

some people in Sābāṭ of Ctesiphon as a historical report and added that it was where Imām accepted any condition laid down by Mu'āwiya.[1]

Even a group of the Iraqi nobles who had joined Mu'āwiya had told him that they were ready to hand in Ḥasan locked up. As narrated by Ibn A'tham, when Qays in a letter informed Imām of the army's surrender, Imām called on the distinguished among his disciples saying, "O Iraqi people! What should I do with you? This is a letter from Qays who has written that your chiefs have joined Mu'āwiya. By Allāh it comes as no surprise. In Ṣiffīn you forced my father to accept the arbitration and when he did so you objected. When for the second time he summoned you to war against Mu'āwiya, you delayed until he was endowed with divine generosity. Quite unwillingly after that you swore allegiance to me. I trusted your allegiance and took a step. Allāh Himself is fully aware of my intention. But see what you have done. O people, these all suffice me, deceive not me about my religion."[2]

Imām's remarks prove that he had not even the least doubt about the war but people's unpleasant behavior had harassed him.

MU'ĀWIYA AND REQUEST FOR COMPROMISE

What elucidates Imām's stance is that he had on no accounts demanded to compromise. It was Mu'āwiya who desired to besiege Iraq with no trouble and insisted to convince Imām to abdicate. In spite of the fact, some sources based on the rumors and those narrators who called them historical reports have claimed that it was Imām who suggested the compromise willingly.[3] Yet in return we mention some proofs one of which is what Ya'qūbī has recounted. Mu'āwiya sent a group to Sābāṭ for talks with Imām Ḥasan (a) about the compromise. It was exactly the meeting therein Imām declined to compromise.[4] Accordingly, Mu'āwiya's first request was declined. Another proof is Imām's letters in which he had persisted in war and threatened that if he did not surrender, he would face his army.

Imām also told Mu'āwiya's envoy,"Tell that sword will judge between you and me." All demonstrate that Imām's intention was to battle.

---

[1]. Tardjamat al-imām al-Ḥasan, Ibn Sa'd, p.169

[2]. al-Futūḥ, vol.IV, p.157; compare with Imām's distorted remarks in Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.III, p.39

[3]. al-Bidāya wa l-nihāya, vol. VIII, p.14; al-Kāmil fi l-tārikh, vol. III, p.205

[4]. Tārikh al-ya'qūbī, vol.II, p.215

The other one was what Imām told people," Mu'āwiya has suggested a compromise there is no honor in. If prepared, I am with you to battle but if worldly life is vital for you, tell me to compromise."[1]

Sibṭ Ibn Djawzī narrated,

"When Imām Ḥasan (a) found out people have left him alone and have betrayed him, he had to accept to compromise. Earlier Mu'āwiya had requested but Imām had rejected. And it was Mu'āwiya who wrote to him many times."[2]

"Mu'āwiya wrote to Imām about compromise", Shiykh Mufīd has said.[3]

As we discussed earlier, the rumors Mu'āwiya had spread had made some historians believe that Imām had been the one suggesting the compromise. Reportedly, Mu'āwiya sent his spies to rumor among the vanguard that Ḥasan has in a letter demanded Mu'āwiya to compromise and say,"What do you jeopardize your life for?"[4] Also in order to mislead 'Ubayd Allāh Ibn 'Abbās, he wrote, ان الحسن قد راسلني في الصلح[5] "Ḥasan wrote to me about compromising."

These rumors later were recorded as historical narrations and changed the reality diametrically.

Why the Compromise Was Accepted

There were several reasons that hindered Imām to achieve his goal, a mighty and honorable battle against Mu'āwiya. To safeguard the principal Islam and impede fruitless bloodshedding, he had to avoid battling. We point to some reasons below,

A.The most crucial reason for why Imām adopted a new position was people's weakness in supporting him. No one can ever claim that Imām was never determined to fight with Mu'āwiya inasmuch as his remarks and position had already proved the reverse. What took place in Sābāṭ obviously showed how incapable were the people in keeping on their struggle. It was then, according to Shiykh Mufīd, Imām found out that people had disparaged him.[6] A large number from among these people had been killed

---

[1]. Tardjamat al-imām al-Ḥasan, Ibn 'Asākir, pp.178-179; al-Kāmil fi l-tārīkh, vol.III, p.406; (A'lām al-Dīn) p.181; Biḥār al-anwār, vol.XXXXIV, p.21; Tadhkirat al-khawāṣ, p.199

[2]. Tadhkirat al-khawāṣ, p.197

[3]. Biḥār al-anwār, vol.XXXXIV, p.48

[4]. Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, vol.XI, p.42

[5]. Ibid.

[6]. al-Irshād, vol. II, p.13

in wars of Djamal, Ṣiffīn and Nahrawān and now tired of any battle not only they felt no strength to fight but also they considered Ahl al-Bayt as debtors. They believed that Imām was responsible for the murdered.

As soon as Imām learnt that many soldiers have fled, he addressed people as saying,"You disobeyed my father to continue fighting and let the arbitrators judge while my father disagreed. He called upon you to keep on the war but you feared until he was killed. Later you came up to me and swore allegiance. You vowed to battle against any one I battled and compromise with any one I compromised. Today I heard that your nobles have joined Mu'āwiya. It dose suffice me. Deceive me not about my religion."[1]

Concerning the reason for Imām's abdication, Djāḥiẓ has written,"When he found these people's behavior towards his father and had known how capricious they were, he had to relinquish the power."[2]

Imām realized that he could not trust such people. This inconfidence was not only for lack of cooperation on their part but Imām stated, والله لو قاتلت معاويه لأخذوا بعنقي حتى يدفعوني اليه سلماً[3] "By Almighty Allāh, if I clash with Mu'āwiya, they will grasp hold of my neck and hand me over locked up."

Elsewhere he has said, ورأيت أهل العراق، لايثق بهم أحد أبداً الا غلب "Iraqi people are those whom anyone trusted, was defeated, for no one agrees with another. They are never serious either about the wrong or the right."[4]

With such people battling with determined and united people of Damascus was impossible. The sad remarks of Imām 'Alī (a) made in 39 and 40 A.H. do convince any equitable individual that there was no other alternative but handing Iraq to Damascus. Never ever could Imām Ḥasan (a) surrender himself and a number of his Shi'ite Muslims bare-handed to Damascus people whose commander was Busr Ibn Arṭāt, bloodthirsty. Now compromising was the only way for protecting Iraq from being plundered. Although it seemed possible that Imām and his small army resist and be martyred, rarely did it bear fruit. Mu'āwiya had poisoned the atmosphere through the slogan of 'Uthmān's blood. In addition to Damascus, Egypt and other areas were now in his hand. At this point, Imām with that precedence and eloquence could do nothing and it had no reason but Iraq's ineptness before Damascus. Hence, Imām's martyrdom could solve no problem. Mu'āwiya was absolutely infamous and there was no need to make him

---

[1]. Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, vol.XVI, p. 22

[2]. Risālat Djāḥiẓ fī Banū Umayya printed in 'Aṣr Ma'mūn, vol.III, p.7

[3]. 'I'lām al-warā, p. 205; Biḥār al-anwār, vol.XXXXIV, p.20; 'Awālim al-'ulūm, vol.XVI, p.175

[4]. al-Kāmil fi l-tārikh, vol.III, p.405

known. At times, Imām was mistakenly introduced as the one loathing bloodshedding. It can never be accepted. He participated in wars of Djamal and Ṣiffīn actively and confirmed his father's tradition. What Imām loathed was futile bloodshedding with no politically clear results.

B. Another reason was that waging a war normally depended upon people's presence and a ruler to a limited extent could force them to battle. Two points merit consideration. One is whether a Muslim ruler could under any circumstances and even with overt disagreement of the majority start the war. If he were entitled to, under what conditions should he do so? The other point is that supposing he did so, would it be for the good of the Muslim nation or not?

The Prophet's tradition was that he basically consulted the Muslims on war affairs. Considering the wars during his lifetime, we discussed it in detail. It occurred while firstly he had already secured allegiance from them and secondly since Djihād was one of the practical laws of Islam, it was Muslims' duty the same as prayer. So why did he consult them regardless of these two points? One reason was because war was a heavy burden which was supposed to be carried by people. Prayer took a little time for a Muslim to do whereas war might cause heavy casualties and damages or make many homeless. When one was martyred, a tribe was bereaved. Naturally, people themselves should have become aware through consultation and shouldered the responsibility a bit. Although Djihād was a practical law of Islam, Allāh's Apostle did never call upon Anṣār to participate in wars before Badr because they had committed not. Only in Badr did they participate after their leaders declared readiness. Later on, he had also consulted them in Uḥud and Aḥzāb.

Whether to compose people to combat or not is a point that should be considered. Imām 'Alī (a) has always been set to convince them either through advice or perhaps through having a whip in hand. Under no circumstances, did he try to coerce them by sword or torture.[1]

He stated explicitly, "Yesterday I was the one who commanded, but today I am commanded. Yesterday I was the one who prohibited but today I am prohibited. You love to survive and, ليس لي أن احملكم ما تكرهون I never ever compel you to do what you dislike. [2]

Imām Mudjtabā (a) was also faithful to this very method. When finding that they were not willing to have such an Imām nor were they prepared to defend themselves against Damascus, it looked quite natural that he left Iraq for Medina after giving essential advice that was mostly given in advance by

---

[1]. al-Ghārāt, p.173 (Persian version)

[2]. Nahdj al-balāgha, sermon 208; Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, vol.II, p.220; vol.XI, p.29

his father. Imām 'Alī (a) had already foretold them what an intolerable situation they would have in the future,"Be informed that thou will get into three great difficulties after me, an epidemic objectless, fatal sword and despotism. Then thou will desire that thou could have seen me, helped me and sacrificed thyself for me." [1]

Facing such hard status in Iraq and people's indifference to his demands for a war, Imām Ḥasan (a) expressed his transparent position under the pressure of Mu'āwiya's insistence on his resignation. First of all Imām declared that there was no doubt about the war against Damascus. والله لا يثنينا عن أهل الشام شك ولا ندم، وإنما نقاتل أهل الشام بالصبر والسلامة "No doubt or regret will prevent us from battling with Damascus. Forebearingly and calmly we will fight."

Concerning people's morale, he added,"You differ greatly from the past. Once you were getting prepared for Ṣiffīn, your religion was prior but today you give priority to this worldly life over your religion. Now between two bloody wars of Ṣiffīn and Nahrawān you weep for those you have lost and want to take revenge... but Mu'āwiya has called upon us to compromise while in the compromise no honor and justice can be ever found, ألا وانّ معاوية دعانا الى أمر ليس فيه عزّ ولا نصفة "Beware that Mu'āwiya called us to do something neither of sublimity nor fairness."

Therefore, Imām announced that compromising would on no accounts be for the good of the nation after all. Then he urged people to tell him what course to pursue. فان أردتم الموت رددناه عليه وحاكمناه الى الله عز وجل بظبى السيوف، وان أردتم الحياة قبلناه وأخذنا لكم الرضى "If you are prepared to fight, let's decline their request and rely on our swords, allow Allāh to pass judgment. But if you like to survive, let's accept their request and provide you with security."

At the same time, people shouted from four corners of the mosque saying, البقية البقية "The remainders, the remainders..." and signed the peace pact.[2]

Elsewhere he said, اني رأيت هوى عظم الناس في الصلح، وكرهوا الحرب فلم احب أن أحملهم على ما يكرهون "I found people mostly willing to compromise yet unwilling to fight. Never do I like to impose what they dislike."[3] أرى أكثركم قد نكل عن الحرب وفشل في القتال ولست أرى أحملكم على ما تكرهون "I realized how weak you have gone

---

[1]. al-Ghārāt, p. 185

[2]. Tardjamat al-imām al-Ḥasan (a), Ibn 'Asākir, pp. 178-179; al-Kāmil fi l-tārikh, vol.III, p.406; A'lām al-Dīn, p.181; Biḥār al-anwār, vol.XXXXIV, p.21; Tadhkirat al-khawāṣ, p. 199

[3]. Akhbār al-ṭiwāl, p.220

and how reluctant you have turned to fight. So I am not the one who compels you to do what you disgust."[1]

Imām referred to people's non-cooperation as the reason for abandoning his caliphate. There was no other solution the normal situation. He stated, [2]والله اني سلّمت الامر لاني لم أجد انصاراً ولو وجدت نصاراً لقاتلتة ليلي ونهاري حتى يحكم الله بيننا وبينه "By Almighty Allāh, I abandoned it for I had no helper. If there were a helper to me, I would fight him day in and day out until Allāh judge between him and me."

C. Imām's the other reason for accepting the compromise was protecting the Shi'ite Muslims' lives. Those objecting to Imām were of two groups, the extremists, the Khāridjites, who had the same clash with Imām 'Alī (a) as well and the revolutionary Shi'ite Muslims who could never stand compromising.

There was a few among those objecting who described Imām as, مذلّ المؤمنين "the one who humiliates the believers."

Yet, in return Imām considered the acceptance of the compromise as honor and described himself as, معز المؤمنين "The one who holds the believers dear."

He justified it as follows, اني لّما رأيت ليس بكم عليهم قوّة، سلمت الامر لأبقى أنا وأنتم بين أظهركم "When I found thee not powerful enough, I preferred to compromise so that thou and I could survive."

Next utterances manifest that by their and his surviving he meant safeguarding Shi'ism. Somewhere else, Imām has likened his action to piercing the ship by a scholar with Moses whose aim was preserving the ship for her owners.[3]

He also had said, فصالحت بقياً على شيعتنا خاصّة من القتل فرأيت دفع هذه الحروب الى يوم مّا، فانّ الله كل يوم هو في شأن "I did compromise to save the Shi'ite Muslims' lives. I pondered over delaying these wars for every day Allāh deals with an affair."[4]

In an answer to one of the objectors Imām said, ما أردت بمصالحتي معاوية الا أن أدفع عنكم القتل عندما رأيت تباطيء أصحابي عن الحرب ونكولهم عن القتال "With the aim of at least protecting your lives I compromised with Mu'āwiya when I found my disciples weak and unwilling to fight."[5]

---

[1]. Akhbār al-ṭiwāl. p.217

[2]. Biḥār al-anwār, vol.XXXXIV, p.147; pp. 45-46

[3]. Biḥār al-anwār, vol.XXXXIV, p.19; Tuḥaf al-'Uqūl, p. 227; 'Awālim al-'ulūm, vol.XVI, p.175; Farā'id al-simṭayn, vol.II, p.120

[4]. Akhbār al-ṭiwāl, p. 220; Manāqib Ibn Shahr Āshūb, vol. IV, p. 35

[5]. Akhbār al-ṭiwāl, p. 221

Answering another objector, Imām likened his compromise to the Prophet's with a difference that had been a compromise with the disbelievers, بالتنزيل "Ordered directly by Allāh with revelation."

But his compromise was with the disbelievers بالتأويل "Indirectly through interpretation."

Then he added, ولولا ما أتيت، لما ترك من شيعتنا على وجه الارض أحد الا قتل "If I had not done so, no Shi'ite Muslim would have survived."[1]

When Ḥudjr Ibn 'Adī objected, Imām reacted as saying, يا حجر! ليس كل الناس يحب ما تحب، وما فعلت الا ابقاء عليك، والله كل يوم هو في الشأن "O Ḥudjr! all do not like what you like. I did so for nothing but saving your life and others'. Allāh also deals with an affair every day."[2] يا مالك! لاتقل ذلك، اني لما رأيت الناس تركوا ذلك الا أهله، خشيت أن تجتثوا عن وجه الارض، فأردت أن يكون للدين في الارض ناعي "O Mālik! say not so, Imām addressed Mālik Ibn Ḍamra when objecting, when I saw how people but a few left me on my own, I feared you be wipped off the face of the earth. Hence, I decided to make one survive cry out for the religion on the earth."[3]

He also said, انما هادنت حقناً للدماء وصيانتاً واشفاقاً على نفسي وأهلي والمخلصين من أصحابي "I agreed to compromise to both prevent bloodshed and save my life, my family's and my faithful disciples."[4]

The objectors were mostly faithful to Ahl al-Bayt. Such individuals from among them as Ḥudjr Ibn 'Adī who deemed caliphate no one's right but 'Alī's family tried to resist anyway due to their hatred of the Umayyads as well as their revolutionary spirit. The above mentioned remarks that were intentionally elaborated demonstrate Imām's great insight and logic. He was well aware that Mu'āwiya, in the guise a rightful man, with his large and foolish army could easily suppress limited Iraqi troops and massacre the distinguished Shi'ite Muslims and 'Alawites under the pretext of revenge for 'Uthmān's murder. Mu'āwiya had changed anything for his benefit. Only a few eminent disciples were survived who were mighty enough to stand against him. Until then he could make Iraq have doubts as well. With any possible way he could keep the Iraqis far away from Imām. When Mu'āwiya intended to conquer Iraq at the end of Imām 'Alī's term, Imām could do nothing other than what his son, Ḥasan, did. The devoted persons with Imām Ḥasan were too few to wage a war. In order to prove that if Imām 'Alī (a) were in such a situation, he would surely have no other alternative, we refer

---

[1]. 'Ilal al-sharā'I', vol.I, p.211; 'Awālim al-'ulūm, vol.XVI, p. 174

[2]. Biḥār al-anwār, vol.XXXXIV, pp.29, 57; Manāqib Ibn Shahr Āshūb, vol.IV, p.35; 'Awālim al-'ulūm, vol.XVI, p.170

[3]. Tardjamat al-imām al-Ḥasan, Ibn 'Asākir, p.203

[4]. 'Awālim al-'ulūm, vol.XVI, pp. 169-170

to the issue of arbitration. When a number objected to Imām ʻAlī why he accepted arbitration, he said,"You see how disobedient my army has become. In comparing to their population you are very few. If we fight, this vast majority of war opponents will turn more hostile towards you than the Damascus army. If they ally with the Damascus troops, all of you will be massacred. By Almighty Allāh, I myself am never pleased with arbitration but I had to approve the majority decision for I was greatly worried about your lives".[1]

Anyhow, Shiʻite Muslims' protection was an incumbent duty that made Imām to approve what for which valor was needed. It is of significance for an Imām or anyone of this type that he carry out his lawful responsibility not care about people's harsh sarcasm which leads to his and his companies' annihilation.

Regarding his compromising, Imām Mudjtabā said, والله، الذي عملت، خير لشيعتي مما طلعت عليه الشمس[2]"By Allāh, what I did was far better than what sun shines and sets for my Shiʻite Muslims."

In the same respect Imām Bāqir (a) has said, والله، الذي صنع الحسن بن علي (ع) كان خيراً لهذه الامة مما طلعت عليه الشمس[3] "By Allāh, what Ḥasan Ibn ʻAlī did was far better than what to which sun shines for this nation."

IMĀM ḤUSAYN (A) AND COMPROMISE

We discussed earlier that a group of historians and tradionists have done their utmost to introduce the two brothers different. The false notion concerning their opinions about compromise was propounded in such a way as though Imām Ḥusayn had denied the compromise and objected to his brother. It was justified, however, that Imām Ḥusayn (a) had been faithful to his father's policy whereas Imām Ḥasan had not approved of the policy of fighting. As already shown, Imām Mudjtabā had been of the same mind about the war and it was quite explicit in his remarks.

Imām Ḥusayn is quoted as objecting to his brother, أعيذك بالله ان تكذّب علياً في قبره وتصدّق معاوية "I take refuge in Allāh that you deny ʻAlī in grave and confirm Muʻāwiya!"[4]

It is also narrated in Madā'inī that Imām Ḥusayn (a) balked at compromising until his brother convinced him.[1] Against such claims there

---

[1]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.II, p.338; Tardjamat l-Imām l-Ḥasan, Ibn ʻAsākir, p.203 (footnote)

[2]. Farā'id al-simṭayn, vol.II, p.124; Biḥār al-anwār, vol.XXXXIV, p.19

[3]. Biḥār al-anwār, vol.XXXXIV, p.25; Rawḍa al-kāfī, p.330

[4]. Tardjamat al-imām al-Ḥasan, Ibn ʻAsākir, p. 178

are many proofs indicating that Imām Ḥusayn (a) had known no other way more appropriate than compromising and had called upon people to obey his brother.

First, Imām Ḥusayn's practical way of conduct was indifference to the remarks and actions trying to set him against his brother and introduce him as the Shi'ite Muslims' leader in Iraq. To the very last moment of his brother's life, Imām Ḥusayn was beside him living like him in Medina. For eleven years even after his brother's martyrdom, his position was exactly as that of his brother's. It demonstrates that without a shadow of a doubt he agreed to compromise.

Second, Resentful of compromising, the extremist Shi'ite Muslims came up to Imām Ḥusayn urging him to undertake their leadership.

'Alī Ibn Muḥammad Ibn Bashīr Hamdānī recounted, "Sufyān Ibn Abī Laylā and I went to Medina to meet Ḥasan Ibn 'Alī (a). When we stepped in, Musayyib Ibn Nadjba along with a number was there. I greeted him, السلام عليك يا مذل المؤمنين "Peace be upon you who humiliated the believers."

Peace be upon you too, said Imām calmly, sit down. I never humiliated the believers but I held then dear. I compromised for the sake of naught but protecting you.

He added, "We went to visit his brother, Ḥusayn, and inform him of what Ḥasan had said".

Imām Ḥusayn said, صدق ابو محمد، فليكن كل رجل منكم حلساً من أحلاس بيته مادام هذا الانسان حيا فان يهلك وانتم احياء رجونا أن يخيّر الله لنا ويؤتنا رشدنا ولايكلنا الى انفسنا "My brother is true. All of you should stay at home as long as Mu'āwiya is alive. If he were dead and you alive, may Allāh do what our progress is in and may He leave us not on our own."[2]

When he was demanded to rise up, Imām Ḥusayn said, أما أنا، فليس رأيي اليوم ذلك، فالصقوا رحمكم الله بالارض واكمنوا البيوت واحترسوا الظنة مادام معاوية حياً "Now I do not believe so. Mercy on you, as long as Mu'āwiya is alive, stay at home and avoid being suspected."[3]

Imām's referring to Mu'āwiya's existence reveals that he was fully conscious of the prevailing situation which led to compromising. The role Mu'āwiya played was pivotal. Anyhow, afte the compromise was finalized, the two brothers left Kūfa for Medina.

---

[1]. Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, vol.XVI, p. 23; al-Bidāya wa l-nihāya, vol. VIII, p. 26; Usd al-ghāba, vol. II, p. 20; Kashf al-ghumma, vol.II. p.247; Tadhkirat al-khawāṣ, p.197

[2]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.I, p.150; Akhbār al-ṭiwāl, p. 221; al-Imāma wa l-siyāsa, vol.I, p. 187

[3]. Akhbār al-ṭiwāl, p.222

PEACE PACT

Concerning the articles stipulated in the pact and signed by Imām Ḥasan (a) and Mu'āwiya, there is no perfect consensus in historical sources. Not only the rumors spread then, but also the spitefulness of historians and Tradionists impacted on the articles. Magnifying some articles, censoring some others, counterfeiting some and ignoring the principal conditions are seen in historical narrations as distortion.[1] Heedless of these cases, there are various narrations in this regard each of which has mentioned one part of the authentic text. Āl Yāsīn and some others have compiled these narrations and presented as a whole. Here we present the authentic text and then other narrations sporadically reported.

A number of sources by Ibn A'tham Kūfī, Balādhurī and Ibn Shahr Āshūb have described the perfect text of the pact as an official treaty. The prefaces confirm the authenticity of the text.

According to Ibn A'tham, when the clash between Imām and Mu'āwiya culminated in a compromise, Imām Ḥasan (a) sent 'Abd Allāh Ibn Nawfal to warn Mu'āwiya that he would never swear allegiance to him unless he vowed that people and their belongings were secure. Nonetheless, when 'Abd Allāh came up to Mu'āwiya, he told him on his own behalf that there were a number of conditions he should meet if he wanted to compromise. First, caliphate would be his provided that he designated Imām Ḥasan as the caliph after himself. Secondly, he should pay fifty five thousand dhms from the public fund to him annually. Finally, he should not merely pay the taxes collected from Dārābdjird to him but also provide people with high security.

Accepting the conditions, Mu'āwiya asked for a white sheet, signed it at the bottom and sent it to Ḥasan Ibn 'Alī (a). When 'Abd Allāh returned and recounted what happened, Imām told him, "Never do I want the caliphate after Mu'āwiya. And about the financial conditions you suggested I should say that it is in no way Mu'āwiya's right to commit himself to paying me from Muslims' treasury.

Then Imām called his amanuensis to write as follows,

بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم، هذا ما اصطلح عليه الحسن بن علي بن أبي طالب، معاوية بن أبي سفيان، صالحه على أن يسلم اليه ولاية أمر المسلمين على أن يعمل فيهم بكتاب الله وسنة نبيه محمد صلى الله عليه وآله وسلم وسيرة الخلفاء الصالحين؛ وليس لمعاوية بن أبي سفيان أن يعهد لأحد من بعده عهداً، بل يكون الأمر من بعده شورى بين المسلمين، وعلى أن الناس آمنون حيث كانوا من أرض الله، شامهم وعراقهم وتهامهم وحجازهم، وعلى أن اصحاب علي وشيعته آمنون على أنفسهم وأموالهم ونسائهم وأولادهم، وعلى معاوية بن أبي سفيان بذلك عهد الله وميثاقه وما أخذ الله على أحد من خلقه بالوفاء بما أعطى الله من نفسه، وعلى أنه لا يبغي

---

[1]. As an example, see Zuhrī's report in Tardjamat al-imām al-Ḥasan, Ibn 'Asākir, p. 168

للحسن بن علي ولا لأخيه الحسين ولا لأحد من اهل بيت النبي صلى الله عليه واله وسلم، غائلة سراً وعلانية ولا يخيف أحدا منهم في أفق من الافاق.[1]

This is a compromise between Ḥasan Ibn Abī Ṭālib and Mu'āwiya Ibn Abī Sufyān. He compromises with him and entrusts caliphate to him provided that he will designate no successor after himself and will allow Muslims' council to designate any one judged competent, for his death is imminent. Another condition is that Muslims must entirely be secure from him. He should behave well towards people. The third condition is that 'Alī Ibn Abī Ṭālib's Shi'ite Muslims, family and agents must be safe anywhere they are and no aggression should be made against them. Hereby Mu'āwiya Ibn Abī Sufyān swears allegiance to Allāh and makes a pledge to be faithful to his allegiance and not to take in. He promises not to do an ill turn to Ḥasan Ibn 'Alī, his brother Ḥusayn and neither of their wives, children, relatives and disciples either overtly or covertly. Anywhere they are they should be safe and never threatened. That is it.[2]

As recorded by Balādhurī, Mu'āwiya wrote a peace pact himself and sent it to Ḥasan Ibn 'Alī (a) as follows,"I did compromise with you on the conditions that the caliphate after me be yours, I conspire not against you, I pay you a million dhms from the public fund plus taxes of Fasā and Dārābdjird."

This text is confirmed by both Muḥammad Ibn Ash'ath Kindī and 'Abd Allāh Ibn 'Āmir which was written in Rabi' al-Ākhir, 41.H.

As soon as Imām read the foregoing text, he said,"He has stipulated something if I yearned for it, never ever would I relinquish the authority". Then he sent 'Abd Allāh Ibn Ḥarth Ibn Nawfal (Ibn Ḥarth Ibn 'Abd al-Muṭṭalib) to tell Mu'āwiya, "If people will be safe, I swear allegiance to him."

Mu'āwiya gave him a white sheet and said, "Write whatever you like".

Imām Ḥasan (a) also wrote what we referred what we referred to previously.[3] The text was cited by Ibn Shahr Āshūb in Manāqib.[4] Madā'inī[5] and Ibn Ṣabbāgh Mālikī[6] also have confirmed the report related to 'Abd Allāh Ibn Nawfal's dispatch and the conditions laid down.

---

[1]. al-Futūḥ, vol.IV, pp.158-160

[2]. al-Futūḥ (translated by Muḥammad Mustuwfī Hirawī into Persian), pp.765-766

[3]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol. III, pp. 41-42

[4]. al-Manāqib, vol. IV, p.33

[5]. Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, vol.XVI, p. 22

[6]. al-Fuṣūl al-muhimma, pp.162-163; 'Awālim al-'ulūm, vol.XVI, p.172

Many sources have referred to the condition of Imām Ḥasan's successorship after Mu'āwiya with presenting no particular text.[1] Some other sources also have confirmed the financial commitments made with regard to the taxes of Dārābdjird, Fasā and Ahwāz in addition to the one-million payment per year.[2] Reportedly, the other condition had been that Mu'āwiya should never curse Amīr al-Mu'minīn (a).[3]

Here, two points merit to be taken into account concerning two conditions, the financial condition and caliphate condition. About the financial condition which is mentioned in different sources and for justifying which a group of Shi'ite Muslims have even discussed in any way[4] it should be kept in mind that the only text we confirm is the one shown before; accordingly, imposing any condition in the accord is basically deemed false. The cogent evidence is the reaction Imām had when finding out that 'Abd Allāh Ibn Nawfal had on his own behalf laid down such conditions and said, "Mu'āwiya is not entitled to commit himself paying me from the Fund."

As far as we know what Imāms' way of conduct had been, such reasoning is clearly conceivable. The question, however, raised here is how the historians have propounded this condition. The answer can easily be inferred form what discussed above. Ibn A'tham had narrated that the condition had been laid down by 'Abd Allāh Ibn Nawfal. As reported by Balādhurī, Mu'āwiya himself had imposed the financial condition among the conditions. Furthermore, seemingly in order to mar Imām's reputation, Mu'āwiya's spies and later courtier historians had spread a number of rumors. It appears that the financial condition had been suggested by the delegation sent by Mu'āwiya to Sābāṭ in Ctesiphon for talks on compromising.[5] Another evidence for proving that there had been no financial condition in the pact is when after the compromise Sulaymān Ibn Ṣurad Khuzā'ī objected to Imām why he had not assigned a proportion.[6]

---

[1]. Tardjamat al-imām al-Ḥasan, Ibn 'Asākir, pp.172,178

[2]. Tārikh al-khulafā', p.74; Tardjamat al-imām al-Ḥasan, Ibn 'Asākir, pp.176-177; Akhbār al-ṭiwāl, pp.217-218

[3]. Tardjamat al-imām al-Ḥasan, Ibn 'Asākir, p.176; A'lām al-Warā, p.206

[4]. For instance it was said that according to the verse of مَا أَفَاءَ اللَّهُ عَلَى رَسُولِه مِنْ أَهْلِ الْقُرَى فَلِلَّه وَلِلرَّسُول وَلِذي الْقُرْبَى. "What God granted His Messenger (s) belongs to Him, the Prophet and his descendants" Imām had a share in Bayt al-Māl, so he had claimed his proportion. Biḥār al-anwār, Vol.IV4, p.10 (footnote); another justification was that Imām had asked the tributes of Dārābdjird for the families of Djamal and Ṣiffīn martyrs; Biḥār al-anwār, Vol.XXXXVI, p.3; 'Awālim al-'ulūm, Vol.XVI, pp.182, 187, 188

[5]. Tahdhīb Tārikh Dimashq, vol.IV. p.224; Tadhkirat al-khawāṣ, p.198

[6]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.III, p.48; Biḥār al-anwār, vol.XXXXIV, p.29

Such reasoning can also be found for the condition of Imām's successorship after Mu'āwiya. It is narrated that based on the signed accord Imām Ḥasan had been supposed to replace Mu'āwiya and if he were dead, his brother should be the successor.[1] This time again Imām was not content to accept what 'Abd Allāh Ibn Nawfal or according to Balādhurī and others[2] what Mu'āwiya had suggested. In return in a text, Imām deprived Mu'āwiya of appointing any successor to himself. He stressed that Muslims should shoulder this responsibility. Since Imām was aware that Mu'āwiya had always been set to make caliphate hereditary, he decided to tie his hands in the accord in this respect. If Imām had said something about his successorship, it would have been the confirmation of hereditary system per se. The term of "Muslim council", however general, could be a way to dispense with the hereditary concept. It might be criticized that it is by no means compatible with the belief in "Naṣṣ" (textual nomination) about Shi'ites Imāms. It should be said that firstly the majority of the people among whom Imām lived did not believe in Naṣṣ and but this way, they had no other choice. Secondly, if legitimacy was judged by Naṣṣ, it would not be incompatible with the principle any way because people's approval is evidently essential in a ruler's legitimacy as a leader in a community. Some points within the peace pact merit consideration,

A. The first vital point was practicing the divine Book, the Prophet's tradition as well as the pious caliphs' lifstyles. Imām's intention was to limit Mu'āwiya within a framework. He referred to this very point while making a speech on the pulpit when Mu'āwiya had come to Kūfa. He said, إنما الخليفة من سار بسيرة رسول الله وعمل بطاعته وليس الخليفة من دان بالجور وعطّل السنن واتخذ الدنيا أباً وامّا "The caliph is the one who practices the Prophet's tradition and obeys him. The caliph is never the one who oppresses, disregards the Prophet's tradition and adores the worldly life like his parents."

وَإِنْ أَدْرِي لَعَلَّهُ فِتْنَةٌ لَكُمْ وَمَتَاعٌ إِلَى حِينٍ.

Who knows, perhaps it is an acid test for you and little goods for Mu'āwiya

he added. Mu'āwiya turned furious at Imām's remarks.[3]

At the same sermon Imām announced, "On a right Mu'āwiya disputed me that was mine but for the good of the nation and hindering bloodshed I ignored it." [1]

---

[1]. al-Futūḥ, vol V, p.14; 'Umdat al-ṭālib, p.67

[2]. Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, vol.XVI, p.21

[3]. Tardjamat al-imām al-Ḥasan, Ibn Sa'd, pp.171, 172

B. Another point was Imām's opposition to a hereditary caliphate that we already discussed in detail.

C. The Shi'ite Muslims' security was one of the crucial principles of the contract. As mentioned before, Imām at the first leg of his talks with Mu'āwiya affirmed that that he would never swear allegiance to him unless Mu'āwiya promised to provide people with security. It is referred to in some narration's that Imām asked clemency of guarantee even for Aḥmar and Aswad. It may imply that Imām stressed on Mawālī's (freed slaves) security as well who were very respectable in Imām 'Alī's sight.

D. Imām's other condition which had a particular significance was that there should be no covert or overt conspiracy against him or his brother, Imām Ḥusayn (a).

With no prerequisite, Mu'āwiya signed the contract owing to the fact that the only thing he wanted was the conquest of Iraq. Mu'āwiya and also Imām himself were certain that he would turn a blind eye to any condition. To none of the conditions was Mu'āwiya faithful. He not only did not follow Qur'ān and the tradition, but also went to extremes more than 'Uthmān. He appointed Yazīd as his successor, and deprived 'Alī's followers (Shi'ites) of security, imposing Ziyād and other tyrants to rule over them. Ḥuṣayn bin Mun*dh*ir used to say: Mu'āwiya did not observe any of the conditions he had agreed to in his treaty with Ḥasan. He killed Ḥujr and his companions, appointed Yazid as his successor and did not delegate the matter of succession to a counsel, and poisoned Ḥasan."

Mu'āwiya came to Kūfa and said, ألا إني كنتُ شرطت شروطاً أردت بها الألفة ووضع الحرب، ألا وإنها تحت قدمي "I agreed on the conditions to put out the fire of sedition and reconcile the people, yet now I disregard them all."[2]

It is also quoted form him as saying, "Never did I fight to have you perform prayers, fast, go Ḥadjdj (pilgrimage) or pay poll tax, I fought to rule over you. And Allāh bestowed it to me whereas you were all unwilling".[3]

A group of residents led by Ḥumrān Ibn Abān decided to revolt against Mu'āwiya in Baṣra. As reported he had been summoning people to swear allegiance to Imām Ḥusayn (a). In order to suppress him, Mu'āwiya sent 'Amr Ibn Arṭāt or his brother, Busr to Baṣra.[4] By the same token, he could

---

[1]. Dhakhā'ir al-'uqbā, p.140; Naẓm Durar al-simṭayn, pp.200-101; Biḥār al-anwār, vol.XXXXIV, p.42; al-Maḥāsin wa l-Masāwī, vol.I, p.53; Tardjamat al-imām al-Ḥasan, Ibn Sa'd, p.173; Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.II, p.43

[2]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.III, pp.44-46; al-Futūḥ, vol.IV, p.163; Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, vol.XVI, p.46

[3]. Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, vol.XVI, p.46

[4]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.III, p.52; al-Futūḥ, vol.IV, p.168

manage to dominate Iraq. He appointed Mughīra Ibn Shu'ba to Kūfa governorship for nine years as long as he was alive and 'Abd Allāh Ibn 'Āmir as Baṣra governor.

Imām Ḥasan's caliphate began in Ramaḍān 40 and terminated in Rabi' al-Ākhir, 41H. after seven months.[1]

IMĀM MUDJTABĀ'S CHARACTER

Imām Ḥasan was born on Ramaḍān 15, 3 A.H. He looked like his forefather, Allāh's Apostle.[2] After his father was martyred, he became the Shi'ite Muslims' leader. It is narrated from Abī Razīn as saying that Imām, wearing black robe and a turban, delivered sermons.[3] Imām Ḥasan was one of the most morally eminent figures whose conduct was an example to follow. We already discussed how repeatedly the Prophet admired him in his remarks and recommended all to feel affection for him. For instance, اللهم إني قد أحببته فأحبّه وأحبَّ من يحبه[4] "O Allāh! I love him, so adore him and the one who loves him." من أحبَّني فليحبه وليبلغ الشاهد منكم الغائب[5] "The one who loves me surely loves him. Tell it to the absentees too." من أحب الحسن والحسين فقد أحبني، ومن أبغضهما فقد أبغضني[6] "Anyone who loves Ḥasan and Ḥusayn, he indeed loves me and anyone who annoys them, he indeed annoys me." من سرّه أن ينظر الي سيد شباب أهل الجنة فلينظر إلي الحسن بن علي[7] "Anyone who likes to see the master of the youth in Heaven can look at Ḥasan Ibn 'Alī and some utterances the Prophet has made about Imām Ḥasan (a)."

Many narrations also are recorded in the light of Imām's ideological features for example his trips as a pilgrim gone on foot. He has said, إني لأستحي من ربي أن ألقاه ولم أمش إلي بيته، فمشي عشرين مرة من المدينة علي رجليه "I am really ashamed of meeting Allāh if I go to His House on horsebac."

He visited there as a pilgrim twenty times.[8] According to another narration, he had gone to Mecca for pilgrimage twenty five times on foot,[1] yet Ibn Sa'd has recorded it as fifteen times.[2]

---

[1]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.III, p.54

[2]. Tardjamat al-imām al-Ḥasan, Ibn Sa'd, pp.130-131

[3]. Ibid. Ibn Sa'd, p.163

[4]. Ibid. Ibn Sa'd, p.139; Sunan al-Tirmidhī, vol.V, p.661

[5]. Tardjamat al-imām al-Ḥasan, Ibn Sa'd, p.138; Musnad Aḥmad, vol.V, p.366; Mustadrak, vol.III, p.173

[6]. Tardjamat al-imām al-Ḥasan, Ibn Sa'd, pp.138,143; Tadhkirat Ṭayālisī, No.2502; Tadhkirat Aḥmad, vol.II, p.440; al-Mustadrak, vo.III, p.166

[7]. Tardjamat al-imām al-Ḥasan, Ibn Sa'd, p.138; al-Bidāya wa l-nihāya, vol.VIII, p.35

[8]. Akhbār Iṣbahān, vol.I, p.44

His generosity for Allāh's sake was a proverbial aspect of his ethical character. When Ismā'īl Ibn Yasār along with 'Abd Allāh Ibn Anas went to meet Mu'āwiya in Damascus and take money from him but they did not succeed, Ismā'īl in a poem addressed his friend Ibn Anas as follows,

لعمرك ما إلى حسن رحلنا و لا زرنا حسيناً يا بن انس[3]

"O Ibn Anas by you we did not go to meet Ḥasan and Ḥusayn."

He implied that if they had gone to those two brothers, never would they have returned empty-handed. It is narrated that some one went to meet Imām Ḥasan while needy.

Imām told him, "Write down whatsoever you need ant then give it to me". When the man gave him the list of what he needed, Imām offered him twice as much.[4] It is pointed out elsewhere that during his lifetime Imām granted three times each time half as much as the property he had for Allāh's sake.[5]

A man named Abū Hārūn recounted, "On our way to Medina for pilgrimage we decided to drop in on the Prophet's son. Visiting him, we talked about our Journey. When we returned, he sent us each four hundred Dīnārs. We went back to him and said that our condition was okay. He answered, لا تردّوا عليّ معروفي[6] "Reject not my generosity."

Imām Ḥasan was told, فيك عظمة "You are great enough." Imām said, لا بل عزّة، قال الله تعالى, فللّه العزّة ولرسوله وللمؤمنين "It is not greatness but honor. Allāh has stated that honor belongs to both Allāh and His Apostle as well as the believers."[7]

After the compromise, the Kūfa's Shi'ite Muslims who came to Ḥidjāz for pilgrimage constantly were in touch with Imām during his eight or nine-year residence in Medina. It was natural that they had approved him as their Imām and tried to avail themselves of him ideologically.

A man from Damascus recounted,"One day I ran in to a handsome and serene man wearing smartly on horseback. I asked who he was. They said he was Ḥasan Ibn 'Alī Ibn Abī Ṭālib (a). I was filled with rage and felt jealous of 'Alī Ibn Abī Ṭālib for having such a unique son. I approached him asking,

---

[1]. Tārikh al-khulafā', p.73

[2]. Tardjamat al-imām al-Ḥasan, Ibn Sa'd, p.159

[3]. al-Aghānī, vol.IV, p.419

[4]. al-Maḥāsin wa l-Masāwī, p.55

[5]. Tardjamat al-imām al-Ḥasan, Ibn Sa'd, p.159; Tārīkh al-Khulafā', p.73; Tadhkirat al-khawāṣ, p.196

[6]. Tardjamat al-imām al-Ḥasan, Ibn Sa'd, p.155

[7]. Rabi' al-abrār, vol.III, p.177

"Are you 'Alī's son?" As soon as I heard his positive answer, I heaped abusive words onto him as many as I could. When I stopped he asked me if I was a stranger. "Yes", I replied.

Then kindly he said, "If you have no place to live, I give it to you, if you need money, I pay you". I parted him while I had no one as dear as him in my heart".[1]

IMĀM ḤASAN'S MARTYDOM

One of Mu'āwiya's unforgivable crimes is martyring Imām Ḥasan (a) who was the apple of the Apostle's eye about which there is no doubt historically. As usual, Mu'āwiya hatched a plot and prompted Dju'da, Imām's wife and cursed Ash'ath Ibn Qays's daughter, to kill her husband. When Medina was plundered in the course of Ḥarra event in 63 AH. this cursed woman's house was plundered too. Nevertheless, due to her cooperation in her husband's murder, her properties all were back. The report of Imām's martyrdom by Dju'da as well as Mu'āwiya's conspiracy is recorded in numerous sources.[2] As narrated by Haytham Ibn 'Adī, Imām had been poisoned by Suhayl Ibn 'Amr's daughter prompted by Mu'āwiya.[3] The poison had Imām stay in bed ill for forty days until he achieved martyrdom.[4]

Miswar's daughter, Umm Bakr said, "Imām had been poisoned many times. Although each time he survived, the last time the poison was so strong that it made the pieces of his liver come out through his throat."[5]

After he was martyred, he was supposed to be buried next to the Prophet's grave according to his last will, but 'Āyisha and Marwān, the ruler of Medina then, did not allow. Imām had advised that if they faced any problem, he should be buried in Baqī'.[6] 'Āyisha did reveal his sheer spite towards Zahrā (a), Her Excellency, and her son once more. No sooner had Imām's corpse been approached to the Prophet's grave than 'Āyisha warned, هذا الأمر لايكون ابداً "Under no circumstances, such an action is possible."[7]

---

[1]. al-Kāmil fi l-adab, vol.I, p.235

[2]. Tardjamat al-imām al-Ḥasan, Ibn Sa'd, pp.175-176; Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.III, pp.55-88. Professor Maḥmūdī has quoted the report above from many sources in the footnotes of the mentioned pages. Yet, Ibn Khaldūn, with his religious Prejudice and unlike all historical proof, has said, وحاشا لمعاوية ذلك "Never ever can Mu'āwīya do so." Tārikh Ibn Khaldūn, vol.II, part 2, p.18

[3]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.III, p.59

[4]. Tardjamat al-imām al-Ḥasan, Ibn Sa'd, p.176

[5]. al-Muntakhab Min Dhiyl al-mudhayyal, p.514

[6]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.III, pp.61, 64; footnotes of pp.61-62

[7]. Tardjamat al-imām al-Ḥasan, Ibn Sa'd, p.184

Both Abū Sa'īd Khudrī and Abū Hurayra addressed Marwān, "Do you prevent Ḥasan from being buried beside his forefather whereas the Apostle (s) had called him the master of the youth in Heaven?"

"If such individuals as you, said Marwān sarcastically, did not narrate the Prophet's hadiths, they would be dissolved soon."[1]

Muḥammad Ibn Ḥanafiyya has narrated that when Imām was killed, Medina turned thoroughly mournful and all people wept. It was Marwān who let Mu'āwiya know saying him,"They want to bury Ḥasan by the Prophet, but as long as I am alive, I will never allow them."

Imām Ḥusayn come up to the Prophet's grave and ordered to dig the ground. Sa'īd Ibn 'Āṣ who was Medina governor pulled back but Marwān commanded the Umayyads to be armed on alert.

"It is impossible to let you", said Marwān.

"It is non of your concern", Imām Ḥusayn (a) told him.

"You are not the governor, are you?" Marwān answered.

"No, but as long as I am alive, I will never let you do this".

Imām Ḥusayn (a) asked Ḥilf al-Fuḍūl (the agreement reached during pre-Islamic period for ensuring the safty of the pilgrims) who were always with the Hāshimites for help. A number of people belonging to the tribes of Taym, Zuhra, Asad and Dja'ūba took up arms then. Imām Ḥusayn (a) and Marwān holding a flag in hand each opened fire on each other. Yet a group of people demanded Imām to practice the will Imām Ḥasan had made."If there were a probability that someone be killed, bury me beside my mother in Baqī'." At last they could convince Imām Ḥusayn.[2] As inferred form another narration, Marwān who was deposed by then was intent to make Mu'āwiya gratified with him by such an action.[3] When Marwān flourished to change Imām's mind, he reported to Mu'āwiya in a bombastic manner.[4]

He said,"How is it possible to see the son of 'Uthmān's murderer buried next to the prophet but 'Uthmān in Baqī'?"[5] Beyond any doubt, Marwān had been among the wickedest figures of the Umayyads throughout whose term as Medina governor cursed Imām 'Alī as well as the Hāshimites.

---

[1]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.III, p.65; Tardjamat al-imām al-Ḥasan, Ibn Sa'd, pp.184-185

[2]. Tardjamat al-imām al-Ḥasan, Ibn Sa'd, pp.177-179

[3]. Tardjamat al-imām al-Ḥasan, Ibn Sa'd, pp.180, 187

[4]. Tardjamat al-imām al-Ḥasan, Ibn Sa'd,, p.188

[5]. Ibid. p.183. 'Uthmān was not even buried in Baqī' because people prevented.

Some believe that Imām was martyred in Rabi' al-Awwal, 49H. While some others have recorded it Rabi' al-Awwal, 50 H.[1] The former seems to be more reliable. As soon as Imām was martyred, the Hāshimites sent some persons to different spots of Medina and the suburbs to inform Anṣār. Reportedly, no one could ever stay at home.[2] The Hāshimites women moaned his loss all day long for a month.[3] Ṭabarī has quoted Imām Bāqir (a) as saying that Medina people shut their shops mourning for him for seven days.[4] He added that in Imām's burial ceremony the participants were so many that there was no elbow- room.[5] News of Imām's martyrdom in Baṣra led the Shi'ite Muslims there to mourn.[6]

After Imām Mudjtabā's demise, Kūfiyān Shi'ite Muslims wrote a letter of consolation to Imām Ḥusayn (a), in which Imām's demise was regarded, on one hand, a tragedy for all Umma and particularly for Shi'ite Muslims, on other hand. This shows formation of "Shī'a" and even its terminological usage around 50 H. They talked about Imām Mudjtabā (a) with these titles, "'Alam al-Hudā and Nūr al-Bilād", someone who was hoped to raise up religion and rehabilitation of conduct of the righteous people. They hoped God would return Imām Ḥusayn's right to him. [7] The letter had to be considered as one of the documents forming Imamate and ideological Shī'a in Kūfa.

'Amr Ba'dja says, "The first humiliation that befell to Arabs was Imām Mudjtabā's demise.[8]

---

[1]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.III, p.66; Tardjamat al-imām al-Ḥasan, Ibn Sa'd, pp.183, 189, 190

[2]. Tardjamat al-imām al-Ḥasan, Ibn Sa'd, p.181; Tardjamat al-imām al-Ḥasan, Ibn 'Asākir, No.371

[3]. Tardjamat al-imām al-Ḥasan, Ibn Sa'd, p.182; Tardjamat al-imām al-Ḥasan, Ibn 'Asākir, No.338

[4]. Tardjamat al-imām al-Ḥasan, Ibn Sa'd, p.182

[5]. al-Muntakhab Al-Muntakhab Dhiyl al-mudhayyal, p.514; al-Mustadrak 'ala l-ṣaḥīḥayn, vol.III, p.173; Tardjamat al-imām al-Ḥasan, Ibn Sa'dp.182; Tardjamat al-imām al-Ḥasan, Ibn 'Asākir, No.372

[6]. Mukhtaṣar Tārīkh Dimashq, vol.V, p.224

[7]. Tārīkh al-ya'qūbī, vol.II, p.228

[8]. Ibn Sa'd, Tardjamat al-imām al-Ḥasan (a), p.183

REFERENCES

1) 'Aṣr al-nabī, Muḥammad 'Izza Darwaza, Beirut, 1964
2) 'Alī Ibn al-Ḥusayn, Dja'far Shahīdī, Tehran, Daftar Nashr Farhang Islāmī
3) 'Aqīdat al-salaf Aṣḥāb al-ḥadīth, Abū Uthmān Ismā'īl Ibn 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-Ṣābūnī, Edited by: Badr 'Abd Allāh al-Badr, Medina, 1415 A.H
4) 'Awālim al-'ulūm, Vol 16, 'Abd Allāh al-Baḥrānī, Qum, Madrisat al-imām al-mahdī
5) Aḥkām al-Qur'ān, Abū Bakr Aḥmad Ibn 'Alī al-Rāzī al-Djaṣṣāṣ, 1335 A.H
6) Aḥkām al-Qur'ān, Abū Bakr Muḥammad Ibn 'Abd Allāh Ibn al-'Arabī, Edited by: 'Alī Muḥammad al-Bidjāwī, Beirut, 1378 A.H
7) al-Aḥkām al-sulṭāniyya wa l-wilāyāt al-dīniyya, Abu l-Ḥasan 'Alī Ibn Muḥammad Ibn Ḥabīb al-Māwardī, Qum, 1406 A.H
8) al-Aḥkām al-sulṭāniyya, Abū Ya'lā Muḥammad Ibn al-Ḥusayn al-Farrā', Edited by: Muḥammad Ḥāmid al-Fiqī, Qum, 1406 A.H
9) Aḥsan al-taqāsīm, Maqdisī, Laiden, 1906
10) A'yān al-shī'a, Muḥsin al-Amīn, Beirut, Dār al-ta'āruf
11) A'imat al-ithnā 'Ashar, 'Ādil al-adīb, Beirut, Dār al-aḍwā'
12) A'immatunā, Muḥammad 'Alī Dukhayyil, Beirut, Dār al-murtaḍād
13) Aḍwā' 'ala l-sunnat al-muḥammadiyya, Maḥmūd Abūrayya, Qum, 1363
14) al-Aṣnām, Hishām Kalbī, Translated to Persian by: Djalālī Nā'īnī, Tehran, 1348 Sh
15) Aṭlas Tārīkh al-islām, Ḥusayn Mūnis, Cairo, 1407 A.H
16) Abū Hurayra, al-Sayyid Sharaf al-dīn, Beirut, Dār al-ta'āruf
17) al-Adhkiyā', Abu l-Faradj Ibn al-Djūzī, Najaf, 1389 A.H
18) al-Aghānī, Abu l-Faradj Iṣfahānī, Cairo, 1963
19) Akhbār al-ṭiwāl, Abū Ḥanīfa al-Dīniwarī, Edited by: 'Abd al-Mun'im 'Āmir, Cairo, 1960
20) Akhbār al-buldān, Ibn Faqīh Hamadānī, Printed by Fuat Sizgīn
21) Akhbār al-quḍāt, Muḥammad Ibn Khalaf Ibn Ḥayyān Wakī', Beirut, 'Ālam al-kutub
22) Akhbār Iṣbahān, Abū Nu'aym Iṣbahānī, Leidan, 1934
23) Akhbār Makka wa mā djā' fīhā min al-āthār, Abu l-Walīd Muḥammad Ibn 'Abd Allāh Ibn Aḥmad al-Azraqī, Edited by: Rushdī *Ṣālih Malhas, Beirut, 1403 A.H*

24) al-Munammaq fī Akhbār Quraysh, Muḥammad Ibn Ḥabīb al-Baghdādī, Edited by: Khurshīd Aḥmad Fārūq, Ḥaydarābād 1384 *A.H*

25) al-Amālī fī Āṣār al-ṣaḥāba, 'Abd al-Razzāq Ibn Hammām al-Ṣan'ānī, Edited by: Madjdī al-Sayyid Ibrāhīm, Cairo, Maktabat al-Qur'ān

26) al-Amālī, Muḥammad Ibn Muḥammad Ibn Nu'mān, al-Shiykh al-Mufīd, Edited by: Ḥusayn Ustādwalī, 'Alī Akbar Ghaffārī, Qum, 1403 A.H

27) al-Amāli, Abū 'Alī Ismā'īl Ibn Qāsim al-Ghālī, Edited by: 'Abd al-Djawād al-Aṣma'ī, Cairo, 1975

28) al-Amwāl, Abū 'Ubayd Qāsim Ibn Sallām Hirawī, *Cairo, 1335 A.H*

29) Andīshih Siyāsī dar Islām Mu'āṣir, Ḥamīd 'Ināyat, Translated by: Bahā' al-dīn khuramshāhī, Tehran, 1362 Sh

30) Ansāb al-ashraf, Aḥmad Ibn Yaḥyā al-Balādhurī, Vol 1, Edited by: Muḥammad Ḥamīd Allāh, Cairo, Dār al-ma'ārif, Vol 2, 3, Edited by:Muḥammad Bāqir al-Maḥmūdī, Beirut, 1397. Vol 4, 5, Baghdad, Maktabat al-muthannā. Vol 4, Edited by: Iḥsān 'Abbās, Beirut, 1400 A.H

31) al-Ansāb, 'Abd al-Karīm Ibn Muḥammad al-Sam'ānī, Edited by: 'Abd al-Raḥmān Ibn Yaḥya al-Mu'allimī, Ḥaydarābād

32) Asbāb al-nuzūl, Abu l-Ḥasan 'Alī Ibn Aḥmad al-Wāḥidī al-Nyshābūrī, Cairo, 1387 A.H

33) Āthār al-ḥarb fi l-fiqh al-islāmī, Wahba al-zuḥaylī, Damascus, 1401 A.H

34) Athar Ahl al-kitāb fi l-fitan wa l-ḥurūb al-ahliyya fi l-qarn al-awwal al-hidjrī, Djamīl 'Abd Allāh al-Miṣrī, Medina, 1410 A.H

35) al-Awā'il, Muḥammad Taqī al-Tustarī, Qum, Maktaba Baṣīratī

36) Bīst Guftār, Mahdī Muḥaqqiq, Tehran, 1355 Sh

37) al-Baḥr al-rā'iq, Ibn Nadjīm, 1331 A.H

38) Baḥth fī Nash'at 'Ilm al-tārīkh 'Ind al-'arab, 'Abd al-'Azīz al-Dūrī, Beirut, 1983

39) Baṣā'ir al-daradjāt, Ṣaffār Qummī, Edited by: Mīrzā Muḥsin Kūchih Bāghī Tabrīzī, Qum, 1404 A.H

40) al-Baṣā'ir wa l-Dhakhā'ir, Abū Ḥayyān al-Tawḥīdī, Edited by: Aḥmad Amīn, Aḥmad Ṣaqar, Cairo, 1373 A.H

41) al-Bad' wa l-tārīkh, Muṭahhar Ibn Ṭāhir al-Maqdisī, *Maktabat al-thiqāfat al-dīniyya*

42) Bahdj al-ṣabāgha fī Sharḥ Nahdj al-balāgha, Muḥammad Taqī al-Tustarī, Tehran, 1390 A.H

43) Bahdjat al-madjālis, Ibn 'Abd al-barr al-Qurṭubī, Cairo, al-Dār al-miṣriyya li l-ta'līf wa l-tardjama

44) Balāghāt al-nisā', Abu l-faḍl Aḥmad Ibn Abī Ṭayfūr, Qum, 1371 Sh

45) al-Bayān wa l-tabyīn, 'Amr Ibn Baḥr al-Djāḥiz, Edited by: 'Abd al-Salām Hārūn, Cairo, 1948

46) Bazmāward, 'Abbās Zaryāb Khūyī, Tehran, 1368 Sh

47) Biḥār al-anwār, 'Allāma Muḥammad Bāqir Madjlisī, Beirut, Mu'assisat al-wafā', 1403 A.H

48) al-Bidāyaw a l-nihāya, Ibn Kathīr al-Ḥanbalī, Beirut, 1409
49) al-Biy'a fī l-niẓām al-siyāsī al-islāmī, Aḥmad Ṣiddīq 'Abd al-Raḥmān, Cairo, 1408 A.H
50) Buḥūth fī Tārīkh al-Qur'ān wa 'Ulūma, Abu l-faḍl Mīrmuḥammadī, Beirut, 1400 A.H
51) Bulūgh al-'irab fī Ma'rifat al-'arab, Maḥmūd Shukrī al-Ālūsī, Edited by: Muḥammad Bahdjat al-atharī, Cairo, 1342 A.H
52) al-Buldān, Aḥmad Ibn Muḥammad Ibn Wāḍiḥ Ya'qūbī, Laiden
53) Dā'irat al-ma'ārif al-islāmiyya, 1933
54) Dā'irat al-ma'ārif Buzurg Islāmī, Tehran, Edited by: Muḥammad Kāẓim Budjnūrdī
55) Dīwān al-Farazdaq, Hammām Ibn Ghālib, Beirut, 1385 A.H
56) Dīwān Shiykh al-Abāṭaḥ, Edited by: Abū Haffān 'Abd Allāh Ibn Aḥmad al-Muhzamī, Edited by: Muḥammad Bāqir al-Maḥmūdī, Qum, 1372 Sh
57) Dalāyil al-ṣidq min Faḍā'il Amīr al-Mu'minīn wa Imāmatu, Muḥammad Ḥasan al-Muẓaffar, Qum, 1395 A.H
58) Dalāyil al-nubuwwa, Abū Bakr Aḥmad Ibn Ḥusayn Ibn 'Alī al-Biyhaqī, Edited by: 'Abd al-Mu'ṭī Qal'adjī, Beirut, 1405 A.H
59) Dalāyil al-nubuwwa, Abū Nu'aym al-Iṣbahānī, Edited by: Muḥammad Rawās Qal'adjī, 'Abd al-Barr 'Abbās, Beirut, 1406 A.H
60) al-Daradjāt al-rafī'a, 'Alī Ṣadr Shīrāzī, Tehran
61) Dhakhā'ir al-'uqbā fī Manāqib Dhawī al-qurbā, Muḥibb al-Dīn Ṭabarī, Beirut, Dār al-ma'rifa
62) Dhamhara Ansāb al-'arab, Ibn Ḥazm al-Andulusī, *Cairo, 1391 A.H*
63) Dhamhara Khuṭab al-'arab fī 'Uṣūr al-'arabiyyat al-zāhira, Aḥmad Zakī Ṣafwat, Cairo, 1352 A.H
64) al-Dharī'a Ilā Taṣānīf al-shī'a, 'Allama Shiykh Āghā Buzurg Ṭihrānī, Beirut, 1403 A.H
65) Dhawāhir al-kalām, Muḥammad Ḥasan al-Ňadjafī, Tehran, 1392 A.H
66) Dhawāmi' al-sīrat al-nabawiyya, Ibn Ḥazm al-Andulusī, Beirut, 1403 A.H
67) Dirāsāt fī Wilāyat al-faqīh, Ḥusayn 'Alī Muntaẓirī, Qum, 1408 A.H
68) Dirāsāt wa Buḥūth fi al-tārīkh wa l-islām, Dja'far Murtaḍā, Qum, 1400 A.H
69) al-Djāmi' al-ṣaḥīḥ, al-Tirmidhī, Medina, 1964
70) Djāmi' Bayān al-'ilm wa Faḍlih, Ibn 'Abd al-Barr al-Qurṭubī, Cairo, 1979
71) al-Djamal, Muḥammad Ibn Muḥammad Ibn Nu'mān al-Shiykh al-Mufīd, Edited by: al-Sayyid 'Alī Mīr Sharaf al-Dīnī, Qum, 1371 Sh
72) Djamhara Nasab Quraysh wa Akhbāruhā, Zubayr Ibn Bakkār, Edited by: Maḥmūd Muḥammad Shākir, Cairo, 1381 A.H
73) Djazīrat al-'arab fī Qarn al-'ishrīn, Ḥāfiẓ Wahba, Cairo, 1387 A.H

74) al-Durar fi Ikhtiṣār al-maghāzī wa l-siyar, Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr al-Qurṭubī, Beirut, Dār al-kutub al-‘ilmiyya
75) al-Durr al-manthūr, ‘Abd al-Raḥmān al-Suyūṭī, Qum, al-Maktabat al-mar‘ashī
76) Duwlat wa Ḥukūmat dar Islām, A. K. S. Lambton, Translated by:…, Tehran, ‘Urūdj
77) al-Fā’iq fi Gharīb al-ḥadīth, Djār Allāh al-Zamakhsharī, Cairo, Maṭba‘at al-Ḥalabī
78) Faḍl al-I‘tizāl wa Ṭabaqāt al-mu‘tazila, Qāḍī ‘Abd al-Djabbār al-Hamadānī, Edited by: Fu’ād Sayyid, Tūnis, 1393 A.H
79) Fadjr al-islām, Aḥmad Amīn, Cairo, Maktabat Nahḍat al-miṣriyya
80) al-Fakhrī fi l-ādāb al-sulṭāṣniyya wa l-duwal al-islāmiyya, Muḥammad Ibn ‘Alī Ibn Ṭabāṭabā Ibn al-Ṭaqṭaqā, Qum 1414 A.H
81) Fann al-sīra, Iḥsān ‘Abbās, Beirut, Dār al-thiqāfa
82) Farā’id al-simṭayn, al-Ḥamwīnī, Edited by: Muḥammad Bāqir al-Maḥmūdī, Beirut, 1398 A.H
83) al-Farq Bayn al-firaq, ‘Abd al-Qāhir Ibn Ṭāhir Ibn Muḥammad al-Baghdādī, Edited by: Muḥammad Muḥyi l-Dīn ‘Abd al-Ḥamīd, Beirut, Dar al-ma‘rifa
84) Fatḥ al-bārī Bi Sharḥ Ṣaḥīḥ al-bukhārī, Ibn Ḥadjr al-‘Asqalānī, Beirut, 1402 A.H
85) Fawāt al-wafayāt, Muḥammad Ibn Shākir al-kutbī, Edited by: Iḥsān ‘Abbās, Beirut, Dār Ṣadir
86) Fi l-‘ubūr al-ḥaḍārī li l-maktabat al-‘arabiyyat al-islāmiyya, al-Kitāb al-thānī: Ka‘b al-Aḥbār, Muḥammad ‘Alī Abū Ḥamda, Ummān, Dār al-bashīr, 1411 A.H
87) Fi l-adab al-djāhilī, Ṭāhā Ḥusayn, Cairo, Dār al-ma‘ārif
88) al-Fihrist, Muḥammad Ibn Ḥasan Ṭūsī, Qum, Raḍī
89) al-Fihrist, Muḥammad Ibn Isḥāq Ibn Nadīm, Edited by:Tadjaddud, Tehran, 1393
90) Fiqh al-khilāfa wa Taṭawuruha li Tuṣbīḥa ‘Uṣbat Umam Sharqiyya, ‘Abd al-Razzāq Aḥmad al-Sanhūrī, Cairo, 1989
91) Fiqh al-lugha wa Sir al-‘arabiyya, Abū Manṣūr Ismā’il al-Tha‘ālibī, Qum, Ismā‘īliyān
92) Fiqh al-sīra, Muḥammad al-Ghazzālī, Beirut, ‘Ālam al-ma‘rifa
93) Firaq al-shī‘a, Abū Muḥammad Ḥasan Ibn Mūsā al-Nuwbakhtī, Edited by: Muḥammad Ṣādiq Āl Baḥr al-‘ulūm, Najaf, 1355 A.H
94) Fitnat al-kubrā, Ṭāhā Ḥusayn, Cairo, Dār al-ma‘ārif
95) al-Fuṣūl al-muhimma, Ibn Ṣabbāgh Mālikī, Tehran, al-A‘lamī
96) al-Fuṣūl al-mukhtāra, Muḥammad Ibn Muḥammad Ibn Nu‘mān al-Shiykh al-Mufīd, Qum, Maktabat al-Dāwarī
97) al-Furūq al-lughawiyya, Abū Hilāl al-‘Askarī, Qum, Baṣīratī

98) Futūḥ al-buldān, Aḥmad Ibn Muḥammad Ibn Yaḥyā al-blādhurī, Edited by:: Riḍwān Muḥammad Riḍwān, Beirut, 1404 A.H

99) Futūḥ Miṣr wa Akhbāruhā, Abu l-Qāsim 'Abd al-Raḥmān Ibn 'Abd Allāh Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam, Baghdad,Maṭba'at al-muthannā, (Leidan, 1912)

100) al-Futūḥ, Abū Muḥammad Aḥmad Ibn A'tham al-kūfī, Ḥaydarābād, 1393 A.H

101) al-Futūḥ, Persian Translation, Translated by: Muḥammad Ibn Aḥmad Ibn Mustuwfī Hirawī, Edited: Ghulām Riḍā Ṭabāṭabāyī Madjd, Tehran, 1372 Sh

102) Futūḥāt A'rāb dar Āsiyāy Markazī, Gib, Translated by: Aḥmadīpūr, Tabrīz

103) Gāhnāmih Taṭbīqī Sih Hizār Sālih, Aḥmad Bīrashk, Tehran, 1367 Sh

104) al-Ghārāt, Abū Isḥāq Ibrāhīm Ibn Muḥammad al-Thaqafī al-Kūfī, Edited by: Mīr Djalāl al-Dīn Muḥaddith Urmawī, Tehran, 1355 A.H; and Persion version: Translated by: 'Abd al-Muḥammad Āyatī, Tehran, 1371 Sh

105) Ghāyat al-Ikhtiṣār fī al-buyūtāt al-'alawiyya al-maḥfūẓa Min al-ghubār, Ibn Zuhra, Edited by: al-Sayyid Baḥr al-'ulūm, Najaf, 1962

106) al-Ghadīr, 'Abd al-Ḥusayn al-Amīnī, Beirut, 1397 A.H

107) Gharīb al-ḥadīth, Abū 'Ubayd Qāsim Ibn Sallām al-Hirawī, Ḥaydat Ābād, 1384 A.H

108) al-Ḥūr al-'ayn, Nishwān al-Ḥimyarī, Edited by: Kamāl Muṣṭafā, Tehran, 1972

109) Ḥadīth al-thaqalayn Tawātira wa Fiqhu, 'Alī al-Ḥusayn al-Mīlānī, Qum, 1413 A.H

110) Ḥarakat al-tārīkh 'Ind al-imām 'Alī, Muḥammad Mahdī Shams al-Dīn, Tehran, 1405 A.H

111) Ḥayāt al-ḥayawān, Dimyarī, Beirut, al-Maktabat al-islāmiyya

112) Ḥayāt al-ṣaḥāba, al-Kāndihlawī, Ḥalab, 1391 A.H. (Beirut, Dār al-qalam, 1968)

113) Ḥayāt al-imām al-Bāqir, Bāqir Sharīf al-Qurashī, Najaf

114) al-Ḥayāt al-siyāsa li l-Imām al-Ḥasan, Dja'far Murtaḍā, Qum, 1405 A.H

115) al-Ḥayāt al-siyāsa li l-Imām al-Riḍā, Dja'far Murtaḍā, Qum, 1401 A.H

116) Ḥayāt Muḥammad, Muḥammad Ḥusayn Hiykal, Cairo, 1354

117) al-Ḥayawān, Abū 'Uthmān 'Amr Ibn Baḥr al-Djāḥiẓ, Edited by: 'Abd al-Salām Hārūn, Beirut, Dār Iḥyā' al-turāth al-'arabī

118) Ḥilyat al-awliyā', Abū Na'īm Iṣbahānī, Beirut, 1387 A.H

119) al-Ḥukūmat al-islāmiyya fī l-aḥādīth al-shi'a al-imāmiyya, Qum, Fī Ṭarīq al-ḥaqq Institute, 1360 Sh

120) al-Hudā Ilā Dīn al-muṣṭafā, Muḥammad Djawād al-Balāghī, Tehran, 1965

121) Huwiyyat al-tashayyu', Aḥmad al-Wā'ilī, Qum, 1362 Sh

122) al-Īḍāḥ, Faḍl Ibn Shādhān al-Niyshābūrī, Beirut, al-A'lamī. Tehran, Edited by: Muḥaddith Urmawī, 1363 Sh

123) al-'Ibar wa Dīwān al-mubtadā' wa l-khabar, (Tārīkh Ibn Khaldūn), Beirut, 1391 A.H

124) al-'Iqd al-farīd, Ibn 'Abdirabbih, Beirut, 1384,
125) al-'Irāq fī l-'aṣr al-umawī, Thābit Ismā'īl al-Rāwī, Baghdad, Maktabat al-Andulus
126) al-Iḥtidjādj, Ṭabarsī, Qum, Quds Muḥammadī
127) I'lām al-warā, Abū 'Alī Faḍl Ibn Ḥasan Ṭabrisī, Tehran, 1390 A.H
128) al-I'lān Bi l-tawbīkh liman Dhamm Ahl al-tārīkh, al-Sakhāwī, translated by: Asad Allāh Āzād, Mashhad, 1410 A.H.
129) al-Iṣāba fī Tamīz al-Ṣaḥāba, Ibn Ḥadjar 'Asqalānī, Cairo, 1328 A.H
130) al-Ifṣāḥ, Muḥammad Ibn Muḥammad Ibn Nu'mān al-Shiykh al-Mufīd, Qum, 1413 A.H
131) Ikhtiyār Ma'rifat al-ridjāl, (Ridjāl Kashshī), al-Ṭūsī, Edited by: Ḥasan Muṣṭafawī, Mashhad University press
132) Ikmāl al-dīn wa Itmām al-ni'ma, al-Shiykh Ṣadūq, Tehran, 11401 A.H.
133) al-Ilmām, al-Nuwayrī al-Iskandarānī, Ḥaydarābād
134) al-Imām al-Mudjtabā, Ḥasan Muṣṭafawī, Qum, Maktabat al-muṣṭafawī
135) *al-Imama wa l-siyāsa, known by "Tārīkh al-khulafā'". Abū Muḥammad 'Abd Allāh* Ibn Muslim Ibn Qutayba al-Dinwarī, Edited by: 'Alī Shīrī, Qum, 1413 A.H
136) Imbirāṭūriyyat al-'arab, Djulūb, Translated to Arabic by: Khayrī Ḥammād, Beirut, 1996
137) al-Imlā' wa l-istimlā', Sam'ānī, Laiden, 1952 A.H
138) al-Imtā' wa l-mu'ānasa, Abū Ḥayyān al-Tawḥīdī, Edited by: Aḥmad Amīn & Aḥmad al-Zayn, Beirut, Dār al-maktabat al-ḥayāt
139) Imtidād al-'arab fī Ṣadr al-islām, Aḥmad Ṣāliḥ al-'Alī, Beirut, 1403 A.H
140) al-Irshād al-sārī Li Sharḥ Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī, Abu l-'Abbās Aḥmad Ibn Muḥammad al-Qasṭalānī, Cairo, Būlāq, 1302 A.H
141) al-Irshād fī Ma'rifa Ḥudjadj Allāh 'ala l-'ibād, Muḥammad Ibn Muḥammad Ibn al-Nu'mān al-Shiykh al-Mufīd, Edited by: Qum, 1413 A.H
142) al-Ishtiqāq, Ibn Durayd, Baghdad, 1399 A.H
143) Islām Barrisī Tārīkhī, Hamilton A.R. Gibb, Translated by: Manūchihr Amīrī, Tehran, 1409 A.H
144) Islām dar Īrān, Peṭrushifskī, Translated to persian by Karīm Kishāwarz, Tehran, 1397 A.H
145) Isrā'īliyyāt wa Atharuhā fī Kutub al-tafsīr, Ramzī *Na'nā'a, Damascus, 1390 A.H*
146) al-Istī'āb, Ibn 'Abd al-Barr al-Qurṭubī, Beirut, *Dār Iḥyā' al-turāth al-'arabī*
147) al-Iṭḥāf Bi Ḥubb al-ashrāf, al-Shabrāwī, Cairo
148) Ithbāt al-waṣiyya, Mas'ūdī, Qum, al-Raḍī
149) al-kāfī, Muḥammad Ibn Ya'qūb al-Kulaynī, Edited by: 'Alī Akbar Ghaffārī, Tehran, 1388 A.H

150) al-Kāmil fī Ḍu'afā' al-Ridjāl, Ibn 'Uday, Beirut, Dar al-fikr
151) al-Kāmil fi l-lugha wa l-adab, Abu l-'Abbās, Muḥammad Ibn Yazīd al-Mubarrad, Edited by: Baydūn - Nu'aym zar zūr, Beirut, 1407 A.H
152) al-Kāmil fi l-tārikh, Abu l-Ḥasan 'Alī Ibn Abi l-Karīm Ibn al-Athīr, Beirut, 1385 A.H
153) Kalīlih wa Dimnih, Naṣr Allāh Munshī, Edited by: Mudjtabā Minawī, Tehran, Amīr Kabīr
154) Kashf al-ẓunūn, Ḥādjī Khalīfa, Beirut, 1402 A.H
155) Kashf al-astār 'An Musnad al-bazzār, al-Hiythamī, Beirut, 1399 A.H
156) Kashf al-ghumma, 'Alī Ibn 'Īsā al-Irbilī, *Tabrīz*
157) Kashf al-irtiyāb, Muḥsin al-Amīn, Fifth Edition
158) al-Kashshāf, Abu l-qāsim Djār Allāh Ibn Maḥmūd Zamakhsharī, Beirut, Dār al-ma'rifa
159) al-Khaṣā'iṣ al-kubrā, Djalāl al-dīn al-Suyūṭī, Cairo
160) al-Kharādj wa Ṣinā'at al-kitāba, Qudāma Ibn Dja'far, Edited by: Muḥammad Ḥusayn al-Zubaydī, Baghdad, 1981
161) al-Khawāridj wa l-shī'a, wellhausen, Translated to persian by: 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-Badawī, Kuwait, Wikālat al-maṭbū'āt
162) al-Khiṭaṭ al-miqrīziyya, Abu l-'Abbās Aḥmad Ibn 'Alī Miqrīzī, Beirut, Dār Ṣādir
163) Khilāfat wa Mulūkiyyat, Abu l-A'lā Muwdūdī, Translated by: Khalīl Aḥmad Ḥāmidī, Pāwih, 1405 A.H
164) *Kifāyat al-athar fī l-naṣṣ 'Alā* 'A'imat al-ithnā 'Ashar, 'Alī Ibn Muḥammad Ibn 'Alī Ibn Kharrāz Qummī, Edited by: 'Abd al-Laṭīf al-Ḥusaynī al-Kūhkamarī, Qum, 1401 A.H
165) Kitāb al-'ulūm (Amālī Aḥmad Ibn 'Īsā Ibn Zayd), Edited by: Muḥammad Ibn Manṣūr Ibn Yazīd al-Murādī
166) Kitāb al-bukhārī, Abū 'Abd Allāh Muḥammad Ibn Ismā'īl al-Bukhārī, Beirut, Dār al-ma'rifa
167) Kitāb Muslim, Muslim Ibn Ḥadjdjādj, Beirut, 1407 A.H
168) Kitāb Sulaym Ibn Qays, Najaf
169) al-Kunā wa l-alqāb, 'Abbās al-Qummī, Qum, Bīdār
170) Lisān al-'arab, Muḥammad Ibn Mukarram Ibn al-Manẓūr, Beirut, 1408 A.H
171) Lisān al-mīzān, Ibn Ḥadjar al-'asqalānī, Beirut, 1390 A.H
172) Lubāb al-albāb, Ibn Munqidh, Cairo, 1354 A.H
173) Lubāb al-nuqūl, Djalāl al-Dīn al-Suyūṭī, Beirut, 1978
174) Mālikiyyat Khuṣūṣī Zamīn, 'Alī Aḥmadī Miyāndjī, Qum, 1404 A.H
175) Mīzān al-i'tidāl, Shams al-Dīn Dhahabī, Beirut, 1382 A.H
176) al-Mīzān fī Tafsīr al-Qur'ān, Muḥammad Ḥusayn al-Ṭabāṭabāyī, Tehran, 1397 A.H

177) al-Maḥāsin wa al-masāwī, Muḥammad Ibn Ibrāhīm al-Biyhaqī, Beirut, 1390 A.H

178) Ma'ādin al-ḥikma, Muḥammad Ibn Fiyḍ al-Kāshānī, Edited by: 'Alī al-Aḥmadī, Qum, 1407 A.H

179) al-Ma'ālim al-athīra fi al-sunna wa l-sīra, Muḥammad Ḥasan Sharāb, Beirut, 1411 A.H

180) Ma'ālim al-khilāfa fi l-fikr al-siyāsī al-islāmī, Maḥmūd al-Khālidī, Beirut, 1404 A.H

181) Ma'ālim al-Madrisatayn, Murtaḍā al-'Askarī, Tehran, 1412 A.H

182) Ma'ālim al-tawḥīd, Dja'far al-Subḥānī, Tehran, 1400 A.H

183) Ma'ānī al-akhbār, Abū Dja'far Muḥammad Ibn 'Alī Ibn al-Ḥusayn Ibn Babiwayh al-Shiykh al-Ṣadūq, Edited by: 'Alī Akbar Ghaffārī, Qum, 1403 A.H

184) al-Ma'ārif, Ibn Qutayba al-Dīnwarī, Edited by: Tharwa 'Ukkāsha, Cairo, dār al-ma'ārif, Qum, 1415

185) al-Ma'rifa wa l-tārīkh, Abū Yūsuf Ya'qūb Ibn Sufyān al-Basawī, Edited by: Akram Diyā' al-'Umarī, Baghdād, 1394 A.H

186) Ma'rifat al-ṣaḥāba, Abū Na'īm al-Iṣfahānī, Edited by: Muḥammad Rāḍī Ibn Ḥādj 'Uthmān, Medina, 1408 A.H

187) Mab'ūth al-Ḥusayn, Muḥammad 'Alī 'Ābidīn, Qum, 1404 A.H

188) al-Madjdī fī Ansāb al-ṭalibīyyīn, Nadjm al-Dīn Abi l-Ḥasan 'Alī Ibn Muḥammad al-'Alawī, Edited by: Aḥmad Mahdawī Dāmghānī, Qum, 1409 A.H

189) Madjmū'at al-wathā'iq al-siyāsiyya fi al-'ahd al-nabawī wa al-khilāfa al-rāshida, Muḥammad Ḥamīd Allāh al-Ḥaydarābādī, Cairo, 1941

190) Madjma' al-amthāl, al-Miydānī, Beirut, Dār Maktabat al-ḥayāt

191) Madjma' al-bayān, Abū 'Alī Faḍl Ibn Ḥasan al-Ṭabrisī, Tehran, Maktabat al-'ilmiyyat al-islāmiyya

192) Madjma' al-zawā'id wa Manba'al-fawā'id, Nūr al-Dīn 'Alī Ibn Abī Bakr al-Hiythamī, Beirut, 1967

193) al-Madjrūḥīn, Ibn Ḥibbān, Edited by: Ibrāhīm Zāyid, Damascus, Dār al-wa'y

194) Madkhal Tārīkh Sharq Islāmī, Jan Suvaje, Translated by: Nūsh Āfarīn Anṣārī, Tehran, 1407 A.H

195) al-Maghāzī al-Ūlā wa Mu'lifūhā, Translated by: Ḥusayn Naṣṣār, Cairo, Maṭba'at al-Ḥalabī

196) Maghāzī Rasūl Allāh li 'Urwa Ibn Zubayr, Edited by: Nūr Sayf, Beirut

197) Makātīb al-rasūl, 'Alī al-Aḥmadī, Qum, 1404 A.H

198) Manāqib Āl Abī Ṭālib, Ibn Shahr Āshūb, Qum, Muṣṭafawī

199) al-Maqālāt wa l-firaq, Sa'd Ibn 'Abd Allāh Ash'arī, Edited by: Muḥammad Djawād Mashkūr, Tehran, 1360

200) Maqāmāt al-'ulamā' Bayn Yaday al-khulafā' wa l-umarā', Abū Ḥāmid Muḥammad Ibn Muḥammad al-Ghazzālī, Edited by: Muḥammad Djāsim al-ḥadīthī, Baghdad, 1988

201) Maqātil al-ṭālibiyyīn, Abu l-Faradj al-Iṣfahānī, Edited by: Kāẓim al-Muẓaffar, Najaf, al-Ḥaydariyya, 1405 A.H; Other printed Edited by: Aḥmad Ṣaqr, Qum, 1414 A.H

202) Maqtal al-imām Amīr al-Mu'minīn 'Alī Ibn Abī Ṭālib, Abū Bakr 'Abd Allāh Ibn Muḥammad Ibn Abi l-Dunyā, Edited by: Muḥammad Bāqir al-Maḥmūdī, Tehran, 1411 A.H

203) Marāṣid al-iṭṭilā', al-Baghdādī, Cairo, 1373 A.H

204) Masā'il al-imāma wa Muqtaṭafāt Min al-kitāb al-awsaṭ fī al-maqālāt, Edited by: Van Ess, Beirut, 1971

205) al-Mi'yār wa l-muwāzina fī Faḍā'il Amīr al-Mu'minīn 'Alī Ibn Abī Ṭālib, Abū Dja'far al-Iskāfī, Edited by: Muḥammad Bāqir al-Maḥmūdī, Beirut, 1399 A.H

206) al-Milal wa l-nihal, al-Shahristānī, Edited by: Muḥammad Fatḥ Allāh Ibn Badrān, Qum, 1405 A.H

207) Min Dawla 'Umar ilā Dawla 'Abd al-Malik, Ibrāhīm Bayḍūn, Beirut, 1411 A.H

208) Min Tārīkh al-adab al-'arabī, Ṭāhā Ḥusayn, Beirut, 1981

209) Muḥāḍarāt al-udabā', Rāghib al-Iṣfahānī

210) al-Muḥabbar, Muḥammad Ibn Ḥabīb al-Baghdādī, Beirut, Dār al-āfāgh al-djadīda, (India 1361 A.H)

211) Mu'allaqāt Sab', Translated to persian by: 'Abd al-Muḥammad Āyatī, Tehran, 1390 A.H

212) Mu'djam al-buldān, Yāqūt Ḥamawī, Beirut, 1399 A.H

213) Mu'djam al-ma'ālim al-djughrāfiyya, 'Ātiq Ibn Ghayth al-Bilādī, Mecca, 1402 A.H

214) Mu'djam al-udabā', Yāqūt Ḥamawī, Beirut, 1400 A.H

215) Mu'djam Qabāyil al-'arab, 'Umar Riḍā Kaḥḥāla, Beirut, Mu'assisat al-Risāla

216) al-Muṣannaf fī l-aḥādīth wa l-āthār, Abū Bakr 'Abd Allāh Ibn Muḥammad Ibn Abī Shayba, Edited by: Kamāl Yūsuf al-Ḥūt, Beirut, 1409 A.H

217) al-Muṣannaf, 'Abd al-Razzāq Ibn Hammām al-Ṣan'ānī, Edited by: Ḥabīb al-Raḥmān al-A'ẓamī, Beirut, 1392 A.H

218) Mudhakkir wa l-tadhkīr wa l-dhikr, Aḥmad Ibn 'Amr al-Shaybānī, Edited by: Khālid al-Radādī, Riyāḍ, 1413 A.H

219) al-Mufaṣṣal fī tārīkh al-'arab Qabl al-islām, Djawād 'Alī, Beirut, 1980

220) Mufradāt Alfāẓ al-Qur'ān, al-Rāghib al-Iṣfahānī, Tehran, Maktabat al-Murtaḍawiyya

221) al-Mukhtaṣar fī Akhbār al-bashar, 'Imād al-Dīn Ismā'il (Abu l-fidā'), Beirut, Dār al-ma'rifa

222) Mukhtaṣar Tārīkh al-'arab wa l-tamaddun al-islāmī, al-Sayyid Amīr 'Alī, Translated to Arabic by: Riyāḍ Ra'fat, Cairo, 1938
223) Mukhtaṣar Tārīkh Dimashq, Muḥammad Ibn Mukarram Ibn al-Manẓūr, Damascus, 1988
224) al-Muntakhab Min Dhayl al-mudhayyal, Muḥammad Ibn Djarīr al-ṭabarī, Cairo, Dār al-ma'ārif
225) Muqadama fī Tārīkh Ṣadr al-islām, 'Abd al-'Azīz al-Dūrī, Beirut, 1960
226) Muqaddamihyī Bar Tārīkh Tadwīn Ḥadīth, Rasūl Dja'fariyān, Qum, 1411 A.H
227) al-Muqni' fī l-imāma, 'Abd Allāh Ibn 'Abd Allāh al-Sudd Ābādī, Edited by: Shākir Shabs', Qum, 1413 A.H
228) Murdji'a, Tārīkh wa Andīshih, Rasūl Dja'fariyān, Qum, 1414 A.H
229) Murudj al-dhahab wa Ma'ādin al-djuwhar, Abu l-Ḥasan 'Alī Ibn al-Ḥusayn al-Mas'ūdī, Beirut, 1358 A.H
230) Musnad al-imām al-Kāẓim, 'Azīz Allāh al-'Uṭārudī, Mashhad, Āstān Quds Raḍawī
231) al-Musnad, Aḥmad Ibn Ḥanbal, Beirut, Dār Ṣādir
232) al-Musnad, Ibn Dja'd
233) al-Mustadrak 'Ala al-vasā'il, Mīrzā Ḥusayn al-Nūrī, Qum, Mu'assesat Āl al-bayt
234) al-Mustadrak 'Ala l-ṣaḥīḥayn, Abū 'Abd Allāh al-Ḥākim al-Niyshābūrī, Ḥaydarābād, 1342 A.H
235) al-Mustarshid fī l-imāma, Muḥammad Ibn Djarīr al-Ṭabarī al-Shī'ī, Najaf, al-Ḥaydariyya
236) al-Muwaṭṭā', Mālik Ibn Anas, Edited by: Muḥammad Fu'ād 'Abd al-Bāqī, Beirut, Dār Iḥyā' al-turāth al-'arabī
237) al-Muwaffaqiyyāt, Zubayr Ibn Bakkār, Edited by: Sāmī Makkī al-'Ānī, Baghdād, 1392
238) al-Muzhir, Djalāl l-Dīn al-Suyūṭī, Edited by: Muḥammad Aḥmad Djād al-mawlā, Cairo, Dār Iḥyā' al-kutub al-'arabiyya
239) Nūr al-abṣār, Muḥammad Mu'min al-Shablandjī, Cairo, Maṭab'at al-Yūsifiyya
240) Naẓm durar al-simṭayn fī Faḍā'il al-muṣṭafā wa l-murtaḍā wa l-batūl wa l-sibṭayn, Djamāl al-Dīn Muḥammad Ibn Yūsuf Ḥanafī Madanī, Edited by: Muḥammad Hādī al-Amīnī, Tehran, Maktabat Niynawā
241) al-Naṣā'iḥ al-kāfiya li man Yatawallā Mu'āwiya, Muḥammad Ibn 'Aqīl, Qum, Dār al-thiqāfa
242) Nahdj al-balāghà, Translated to persian by: Dja'far Shahīdī, Tehran, 1414 A.H
243) Nahdj al-sa'āda fī Mustadrak Nahdj al-balāgha, Muḥammad Bāqir al-Maḥmūdī, Beirut, 1397 A.H
244) Nasab Quraysh, Muṣ'ab al-Zubayrī, Cairo, Dār al-ma'ārif
245) Nathr al-durr, Abū Sa'īd al-Ābī, Cairo, 1981

246) Niẓām al-ḥukūma al-nabawiyya al-musammā , (al-tarātīb al-idāriyya), ‘Abd al-ḥayy al-kattānī, Beirut, Dār al-kitāb al-‘arabī

247) Niẓām al-ḥukm fi l-islām, Muḥammad Fārūq al-Nabhān, Beirut, 1408 A.H

248) Niẓām Wilāyat al-‘ahd wa Wirāthat al-khilāfa fī al-‘aṣr al-umawī, Ḥusayn ‘Aṭwān, Beirut, 1411 A.H

249) al-Nihāya fī Gharīb al-ḥadīth wa l-athar, Abu l-Sādāt Mubārak Ibn Muḥammad al-Djazarī Ibn al-Athīr, Edited by: Ṭāhir Aḥmad al-Zāwī, Maḥmūd Muḥammad al-Ṭannāḥī, Qum, 1364

250) Nihāyat al-irab fī Funūn al-adab, Shahāb al-Dīn Aḥmad Ibn ‘Abd al-Wahhāb al-Nuwayrī, Cairo, 1342 A.H

251) al-Nizā‘ wa l-takhāṣum Fīmā Bayn Banī Umayya wa Banī Hāshim, Taqī al-Dīn al-Miqrīzī, Edited by: Ḥusayn Mūnis, Qum, 1412 A.H

252) al-Nuqūd al-islāmiyya, Taqī al-Dīn Aḥmad Ibn ‘Ali al-Miqrīzī, Najaf, al-Ḥaydariyya, 1387 A.H

253) *Pazhūhishī Darbarih Naqsh Dīnī wa* Idjtimā’ī Qissih Khānān Dar Tārīkh Islām, Rasūl Djafariyān, Qum, 1412 A.H

254) Piyāmbar Ummī, Murtaḍā Muṭahharī, Qum, Ṣadrā

255) Piykār Ṣiffīn, Naṣr Ibn Muzāḥim Minqarī, Translated by: Parwīz Atābakī, Tehran, 1408 A.H

256) al-Qādisiyya, Aḥmad ‘Ādil Kamāl, Beirut, 1404 A.H

257) Qāmūs al-ridjāl, Muḥammad Taqī al-Tustarī, Tehran, 1397 A.H

258) Qiṣih Khānā dar Tārīkh Islām, Rasūl Djafariyān, Qum, 1412 A.H

259) al-Quṣāṣ wa l-mudhakkirīn, ‘Abd al-Raḥmān Ibn al-Djūzī, Edited by: Qāsim al-Sāmirrā’ī, Riyāḍ, 1403 A.H

260) Rabī‘ al-abrāb wa Nuṣūṣ al-akhbār, Abu l-Qāsim Maḥmūd Ibn ‘Umar al-Zamakhsharī, Qum, 1369 A.H

261) al-Radda, Muḥammad Ibn ‘Umar al-Wāqidī, Edited by: Yaḥyā al-Djubbūrī, Beirut, 1410 A.H

262) Rasā’il al-djāḥiz, ‘Abd al-Salām Hārūn, Cairo, 1964

263) Rasā’il al-djāḥiz, Edited by: ‘Alī Abū Malḥam, Beirut, 1987

264) Rasā’il Ibn Ḥazm, Edited by: Iḥsān ‘Abbās, Beirut, 1987

265) al-Rawḍ al-unuf, Abu l-Qāsim ‘Abd al-Raḥmān Ibn ‘Abd Allāh al-Khath‘amī, Edited by: Ṭāhā ‘Abd al-Ra’ūf Sa‘d, Cairo, Maktabat al-kulliyyāt al-Azhariyya

266) Rawḍat al-Wā‘iẓīn, Fattāl Niyshābūrī, Najaf, 1386

267) Rawish Shinākht Islām, ‘Alī Sharī‘atī, Madjmū‘a Āthār, N. 27, Tehran

268) Ridjāl al-nadjāshī, Aḥmad *Ibn ‘Alī Ibn Aḥmad al-Nadjashī al-Asadī al-Kūfī, Edited by: Mūsā Shubayrī Zandjānī, Qum,* 1407 A.H

269) Riyāḍ al-‘ulamā’, Mīrzā ‘Abd Allāh Afandī, Edited by: Aḥmad Ḥusaynī, Qum, 1401 A.H

270) Ruwḍāt al-djannāt, Muḥammad Bāqir al-Iṣfahānī al-Khānsārī, Qum, Ismā’iliyān

271) al-Ṣaḥīḥ Min Sīrat al-nabī al-a'ẓam, Dja'far Murtaḍā, Qum 1403 A.H
272) Ṣaḥīfa Sadjdjādiyya, al-imām 'Alī Ibn al-Ḥusayn
273) Ṣifat al-ṣafwa, Abu l-Faradj Ibn al-Dhūzānī, Damascus, 1390 A.H
274) Ṣubḥ al-`A'shā fī Ṣinā'at al-inshā', Abū al-'Abbās Aḥmad Ibn 'Alī al-Qalqashandī, Cairo, 1383 A.H
275) Ṣulḥ al-Ḥasan, Āl Yāsīn, Baghdad, Dār al-kutub al-'arāqiyya
276) Ṣulḥ al-imām al-Ḥasan, Muḥammad Djawād Faḍl Allāh, Beirut, Dār al-ghadīr
277) al-Sīra al-nabawiyya, Ziynī Daḥlān, Printed with al-Sīrat al-ḥalabiyya, Beirut
278) Sīra Rasūl Allāh, 'Abbās Zaryāb Khū'ī, Tehran, 1412 A.H
279) Sīra wa Qiyām Zayd Ibn 'Alī, Ḥusayn Karīmān, Tehran, 1402 A.H
280) al-Sīrat al-ḥalabiyya, (Insān al-'uyūn fī Sīrat al-amīn al-ma'mūn), 'Alī Ibn Burhān al-Dīn al-Ḥalabī, Beirut, al-Maktabat al-Islāmiyya
281) al-Sīrat al-nabawiyya, Abu l-Fidā' Ismā'il Ibn Kathīr, Edited by: Muṣṭafā 'Abd al-Wāḥid, Beirut, 1407 A.H
282) al-Sīrat al-nabawiyya, Ibn Hishām, Edited by: Muṣṭafā al-Saqqā', Beirut, Dār al-ma'rifa
283) Samṭ al-nudjūm al-'awālī, 'Abd al-Malik Ibn Ḥusayn al-'Iṣāmī, Cairo, 1380 A.H
284) al-Saqīfa wa Fadak, Abū Bakr Aḥmad Ibn 'Abd al-'Azīz al-Dhuwharī, Edited by: Muḥammad Hādī al-Amīnī, Tehran, Niynawā
285) al-Shām fī Ṣadr al-islām, Nadjda Khumāsh, Damascus, 1987
286) al-Shūrā fī l-'aṣr al-umawī, Ḥusayn 'Aṭwān, Beirut, 1410 A.H
287) Shadharāt al-dhahab fī Akhbār Man Dhahab, Ibn al-'Imād al-Ḥanbalī, Beirut, Dār Iḥyā' al-turāth al-'arabī
288) al-Shahīd Muslim Ibn 'Aqīl, 'Abd al-Razzāq al-Muqarram, Najaf
289) Sharḥ Nahdj al-balāgha, Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, Edited by: Muḥammad Abu l-Faḍl Ibrāhīm, Cairo, 1387 A.H
290) Sharḥ Uṣūl al-khamsa, Qāḍī 'Abd al-Djabbār Hamadānī, Cairo, 1385 A.H
291) Sharaf Aṣḥāb al-ḥadīth, Abū Bakr Aḥmad Ibn 'Alī Ibn Thābit al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, Edited by: Muḥammad Sa'īd Khaṭīb Ūghlī, Ankara, 1971
292) Shi'r al-khawāridj, Edited by: Iḥsān 'Abbās, Beirut, 1974
293) al-Shi'r wa l-shu'arā', Abū Muḥammad 'Abd Allāh Ibn Muslim Ibn Qutayba al-Dīnwarī, Beirut, Dār Ṣādir
294) Siyar A'lām al-nubalā', Shams al-Dīn al-Dhahabī, Beirut, Mu'assisat al-Risāla
295) al-Siyar wa l-maghāzī, Muḥammad Ibn Isḥāq, Edited by: Suhayl Zakkār, Beirut, 1398 A.H
296) Subul al-hudā wa l-rashād fī Sīra Khayr al-'ibād, Muḥammad Ibn Yūsuf al-Ṣāliḥī al-Shāmī, Edited by: Muṣṭafā 'Abd al-Wāḥid, Cairo, 1392 A.H

297) Sunan al-dārimī, Abū Muḥammad ‘Abd Allāh Ibn Bahrām al-Dārimī, Beirut, 1398 A.H

298) Sunan al-kubrā, Abū Bakr Aḥmad Ibn Ḥusayn al-Biyhaqī, Ḥaydarābād, 1344 A.H

299) Sunan al-nasā’ī, Abū ‘Abd al-Raḥmān Aḥmad Ibn Shu‘ayb Ibn ‘Alī al-Nisā’ī, Beirut, Dār al-fikr

300) Sunan Ibn Mādja, Abū ‘Abd Allāh Muḥammad Ibn Yazīd al-Qazwīnī Ibn Mādja, Edited by: Muḥammad Fu’ād ‘Abd al-Bāqī, Beirut, Dār Iḥyā’ al-turāth al‘arabī

301) al-Sunna, Abū Bakr Aḥmad Ibn Muḥammad Ibn Hārūn Ibn Yazīd al-Khallāl, Edited by: ‘Aṭiyya al-Zahrānī, Riyāḍ, 1415 A.H

302) Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā, Muḥammad Ibn Sa‘d, Beirut, 1405 A.H

303) Ṭabaqāt al-muḥaddithīn Bi Iṣbahān, Abū Muḥammad ‘Abd Allāh Ibn Muḥammad Ibn Dja‘far Abu l-Shiykh al-Anṣārī, Edited by: ‘Abd al-Ghafūr ‘Abd al-Ḥaqq, Beirut, 1412 A.H

304) Ṭabaqāt al-shu‘arā’, Muḥammad Ibn Sallam al-Djumaḥī, Beirut, 1968

305) Ṭabaqāt Fuḥūl al-shu‘arā’, Muḥammad Ibn Sallām Djumaḥī, Edited by: Maḥmūd Muḥammad Shākir, Cairo, 1400 A.H

306) al-Ṭarā’if Fī Ma‘rifa Madhāhib al-ṭawā’if, Ibn Ṭāwūs, Qum, Maktabat al-Khayyām

307) al-Ṭarīq ila l-madā’in, Aḥmad ‘Ādil Kamāl, Beirut, 1404 A.H

308) Tādj al-‘Arūs, Muḥammad Murtaḍā al-Ḥusaynī al-Zubaydī, Beirut, 1385 A.H

309) Tārīkh Ṣadr al-islām wa l-duwlat al-umawiyya, ‘Umar Farrūkh, Beirut, Dār al-‘ilm li l-Malāyīn

310) Tārīkh Īrān az Islām tā Salādjiqih, Vol 4, Edited by: R.N.Fray, Translated by: Ḥasan Anūshih, Tehran, 1401 A.H

311) Tārīkh Īrān dar Qurūn Nukhustīn Islāmī, Bertold Spuler, Translated by: Djawād Falāṭūrī, Tehran, 1404 A.H

312) Tārīkh al-‘arab fī l-islām, Djawād ‘Alī, Qum, 1413 A.H

313) Tārīkh al-‘arab wa l-islām Mundh Mā Qabl al-mab‘ath wa Ḥattā Suqūt Baghdād, Suhayl Zakkār, Beirut, 1397 A.H

314) al-Tārīkh al-‘arabī wa l-Mu’arrikhūn, Shākir Muṣṭafā, Beirut, 1983

315) Tārīkh al-adab al-‘arabī (al-‘Aṣr al-djāhilī), Shuwqī Ḍayf, Cairo, 1960

316) Tārīkh al-adab al-‘arabī, R. Blacher, Translated by: Ibrāhīm al-Kīlānī, Damascus, 1973

317) Tārīkh al-djahmiya wa l-mu‘tazila, Djamāl al-Dīn al-Qāsimī, Cairo, 1331

318) Tārīkh al-duwlat al-‘arabiyya, Wellhausen, Cairo, 1958

319) Tārīkh al-islām wa Wafayāt al-mashāhīr wa l-i‘lām, Shams al-Dīn al-Dhahabī, Edited by: ‘Abd al-Sallām Tadmurī, Beirut, 1407 A.H

320) al-Tārīkh al-kabīr, Abū ‘Abd Allāh Ismā‘īl Ibn Ibrāhīm al- Bukhārī, Beirut, Dār al-kutub al-‘ilmiyya

321) Tārīkh al-khulafā', Djalāl al-Dīn al-Suyūṭī, Edited by: Muḥammad Muḥy al-Dīn 'Abd al-Ḥamīd, Cairo, 1371 A.H

322) Tārīkh al-madīnat al-munawwara, Abū Zayd 'Umar Ibn Shabba al-Numayrī, Edited by: Fahīm Muḥammad Shaltūt, Qum, 1410 A.H

323) Tārīkh al-turāth al-'arabī, Fu'ād Sizgīn, Qum, Maktabat al-mar'ashī

324) Tārīkh al-umam wa l-rusul wa l-mulūk, Muḥammad Ibn Djarīr al-Ṭabarī, Beirut, al-A'lamī, 1983. Another publication Edited by : Muḥammad Abu l-Faḍl Ibrāhīm, Cairo, Dār al-ma'ārif

325) Tārīkh al-ya'qūbī, Aḥmad Ibn Muḥammad Ibn Wāḍiḥ al-ya'qūbī, Beirut, Dār Ṣādir

326) Tārīkh Baghdād, Abū Bakr Aḥmad Ibn 'Alī Khaṭīb Baghdādī, Beirut, Dār al-kitāb al-'arabī

327) Tārīkh Biyhaq, Abu l-Ḥasan 'Alī Ibn Zayd Biyhaqī, (Ibn Fanduq), Edited by: Kalīm Allāh Ḥusaynī, Ḥaydarābād

328) Tārīkh Djurdjān, al-Sahmī, Edited by: Muḥammad 'Abd al-Mu'īd Khān, Beirut, 1407 A.H

329) Tārīkh Falsafih dar Islām, Vol 2, Edited by: Miyān Muḥammad Sharīf, The persian version, Tehran, 1407 A.H

330) Tārīkh Guzīdih, Ḥamd Allāh Mustuwfī, Edited by: 'Abd al-Ḥusayn Nawāyī, Tehran, 1404 A.H

331) Tārīkh Ibī Zur'a al-dimashqī, 'Abd al-Raḥmān Ibn 'Amr Ibn 'Abd Allāh al-Naṣrī, Dirāsa wa Taḥqīq, Shukr Allāh Ibn Ni'mat Allāh al-Qūdjānī

332) Tārīkh Ibn al-Wardī, Zayn al-Dīn 'Umar Ibn Muẓaffar Ibn al-Wardī, Nadjaf, 1389 A.H

333) Tārīkh Ismā'īliyān, Bernard Lewis, Translated by: Firiydūn Badrihī, Tehran, 1404 A.H

334) Tārīkh Khalīfat Ibn Khayyāṭ, Edited by: Akram Ḍiyā' al-'Umarī, Riyāḍ, 1405 A.H

335) Tārīkh Makka, Aḥmad Subā'ī, Mecca, 1372 A.H

336) Tārīkh Sūriyya wa Lubnān wa Filisṭīn, Philip K. Hitti, Translated by: Kamāl al-Yāziḍjī, Beirut, Dār al-thiqāfa, *3rd edition*

337) Tārīkh Tārīkhnigārī Islāmī, Franz Rosental, Translated by: Asad Allāh Āzād, Mashhad, 1368

338) Tārīkh Tmaddun, Will Durant, Tehran, Intishārāt Āmūzish Inqilāb Islāmī, Second Edition

339) Tārīkh Yaḥyā Ibn Mu'īn, Edited by: Aḥmad Muḥammad Nūr Sayf, Riyāḍ, 1399 A.H

340) Tārīkhnegārī dar Islām, Translated and Edited by: Ya'qūb Āzhand, Tehran, 1403 A.H

341) al-Taḥqīq fī Kalimāt al-Qur'ān, Ḥasan al-Muṣṭafawī, Tehran, 1360

342) Ta'sīs al-shī'a li 'Ulūm al-islām, al-Sayyid Ḥassan al-Ṣadr, Tehran, al-A'lamī

343) Taṭawwur al-fikr al-siyāsī ‘Ind Ahl al-sunna, Khayr al-Dīn al-Sawī, Ummān, 1992 A.H
344) Tabṣirat al-‘awām fī Ma‘rifa Maqālāt al-anām, Edited by: ‘Abbās Iqbāl, Tehran, Asāṭīr
345) Tadhkirat al-ḥuffāẓ, Shams al-Dīn al-Dhahabī, Beirut, 1374 A.H
346) Tadhkirat al-khawāṣ, Sibṭ Ibn al-Djūzī, Tehran, Niynawā
347) Tadjārib al-umam, Abū ‘Alī Muskuwayh, Edited by: Imāmī, Tehran, Surūsh
348) Tadrīb al-rāwī, Djalāl al-Dīn al-Suyūṭī, Medina, 1392 A.H
349) Tafsīr al-furqān, Muḥammad al-Ṣādiqī, Beirut, 1397 A.H
350) Tafsīr al-manār, Muḥammad Rashīd Riḍā, Beirut, Dār al-ma‘rifa
351) Tafsīr al-munīr, Wahba Zuḥaylī, Damascus, Dār al-fikr
352) Tafsīr al-qurṭubī, (al-Djāmi‘ li Aḥkām al-Qur’ān), Muḥammad Ibn Aḥmad al-Anṣārī al-Qurṭubī, Edited by: Aḥmad Ibn ‘Abd al-‘Alīm al-Bardūnī, Beirut, Dār Iḥyā’ al-turāth al-‘arabī
353) Tafsīr Furāt al-kūfī, Furāt Ibn Ibrāhīm Ibn Furāt Kūfī, Najaf, al-Ḥaydariyya
354) Tahdhīb al-kamāl, Djamāl al-Dīn Ibi l-Ḥadidjādj Yūsuf al-Mizzī, Edited by: Bashshār ‘Awwād Ma‘rūf, Beirut, 1402 A.H
355) Tahdhīb Tārikh Dimashq, ‘Abd al-Qādir Badrān, Beirut, Dār al-masīra
356) al-Tamhīd li Tārikh al-falsafat al-islāmiyya, Muṣṭafā ‘Abd al-Rāziq, Cairo, 1966
357) al-Tanbīh wa l-ishrāf, Abu l-Ḥasan ‘Alī Ibn al-Ḥusayn al-Mas‘ūdī, Edited by: ‘Abd Allāh Ismā‘īl al-Ṣāwī, Cairo, 1406 A.H
358) Tanqiḥ al-maqāl fī Aḥwāl al-ridjāl, Asad Allāh al-Māmaqānī, Tehran, al-Murtaḍawiyya
359) Taqwīm Taṭbīqī Hizār wa Pānṣad Sālih Hidjrī Qamarī wa Milādī, Ferdinand Wustenfeld, Edited by: Ḥakīm al-Dīn Qurayshī, Tehran, 1402 A.H
360) Tardhimat al-imām al-Ḥusayn, Ibn Sa‘d, Edited by: ‘Abd al-Azīz Ṭabāṭabāyī, Printed In Turāthunā Magezine, N.10
361) Tardjimat al-imām ‘Alī Ibn Abī Ṭālib, Ibn ‘Asākir, Edited by: Muḥammad Bāqir Maḥmūdī
362) Tardjimat al-imām al-Ḥasan Min Tārikh Dimashq, Ibn ‘Asākir, Edited by: al-‘Allāmat al-Maḥmūdī, Beirut
363) Tardjimat al-imām al-Ḥasan, Ibn Sa‘d, Edited by: ‘Abd al-Azīz Ṭabāṭabāyī, Printed In Turāthunā Magezine, N.11
364) Tardjimat al-imām al-Ḥusayn Min Tārikh Dimashq, Ibn ‘Asākir, Edited by: al-‘Allāmat al-Maḥmūdī, Beirut
365) Tathbīt Dalā’il al-nubuwwa, ‘Abd al-DjabbārIbn Aḥmad al-Hamaḍānī, Edited by: ‘Abd al-Karīm ‘Uthmān, Beirut, Dār al-‘arabiyya
366) *Taysīr* al-maṭālib fī Amālī al-imām Abī Ṭālib, Abū Ṭālib Zaydī, 1395 A.H

367) al-Thiqāf, Ibn Ḥibbān, Ḥaydar Abād, Beiut, 1403 A.H
368) al-Tibyān fī Tafsīr al-Qur'ān, Abū Dja'far Muḥammad Ibn Ḥasan al-Ṭūsī, Edited by: Aḥmad Qaṣīr, Beirut, Dār al-iḥyā al-turāth al-islāmī
369) Tuḥaf al-'uqūl, al-Ḥarrānī, Tehran, Islāmiyya
370) 'Umdat al-ṭālib fī Ansāb Āl Abī Ṭālib, Ibn'Inaba, Najaf, 1380 A.H
371) al-'Uthmāniyya, Abū 'Amr al-Djāḥiz, 1384 A.H
372) 'Uyūn al-akhbār al-Riḍā, Shiykh Ṣadūq, Najaf, 1390 A.H
373) 'Uyūn al-akhbār, Abū Muḥammad 'Abd Allāh Ibn Muslim Ibn Qutayba al-Dīnwarī, Cairo, 1383 A.H
374) 'Uyūn al-athar fī Funūn al-maghāzī wa l-shamā'il wa l-siyar, Abu l-Fatḥ Muḥammad Ibn Sayyid al-Nās, Edited by: Muḥammad al-Khaṭrāwī, Muḥyi l-Dīn Mastū, Medina, 1413 A.H
375) 'Uyūn al-tawārikh, al-Sifr al-awwal, Muḥammad Ibn Shākir Ibn Aḥmad al-Kutbī, Edited by:: Ḥisām al-Dīn al-Qudsī, Cairo, 1980
376) Uṣūl Asmā' al-mudun wa l-mawāqi' al-'arāwiyya, Djamāl Bābān, Baghdad, 1989
377) al-Umawiyyūn wa l-bīzanṭiyyūn, Aḥmad al-'Adwī, Cairo, al-Dār al-qūmiyya lilṭibā'a wa al-nashr
378) al-Umawiyyūn wa l-khilāfa, Ḥusayn 'Aṭwān, Beirut, 1986
379) al-Uns al-djalīl Bi tārikh al-quds wa l-khalīl, Mudjīr al-dīn Ḥanbalī, Qum, 1410 A.H
380) Usd al-ghāba, Ibn al-Athīr, Beirut, *Dār Iḥyā' al-turāth al-'arabī*
381) al-Wā'il, Abū Hilāl 'Askarī, Damascus, 1975
382) al-Wāfidāt Min al-nisā' 'Alā Mu'āwiya, Edited by: Sukayna al-Shahābī, Damascus
383) Wafā' al-wafā' Bi Akhbār Dār al-muṣṭafā, Nūr al-Dīn 'Alī Ibn Aḥmad al-Samhūdī, Beirut, 1404 A.H
384) Wafayāt al-a'yān, Ibn Khallakān, Edited by; Iḥsān 'Abbās, Qum, 1969
Waq'at Ṣiffīn, Naṣr Ibn Muzāḥim al-Minqarī, Edited by: 'Abd al-Salām Hārūn, Cairo, 1382 A.H
385) Waq'at al-djamal, Muḥammad Ibn Zakariyyā Ibn Dīnar al-Ghallābī, Edited by: Muḥammad Ḥasan Āl Yāsīn, Baghdad, 1390 A.H
386) Wasā'il al-shī'a ilā Taḥṣīl Masā'il al-sharī'a, Muḥammad Ibn Ḥasan al-Ḥurr al-'Āmilī, Beirut, 1391 A.H
387) Yathrib Qabl al-islām, Muḥammad al-Sayyid al-Wakīl, Djidda, 1409 A.H
388) Zād al-ma'ād, Ibn Qayyim al-Dhawziyya, al-Mu'assisa li l-Ṭibā'a wa l-nashr
389) al-Zīna, Abū Ḥātam Aḥmad Ibn Ḥamdān Rāzī, Edited by: 'Abd Allāh al-Sāmirrā'ī
390) al-Zawādj al-muwaqqat fī l-islām, Dja'far Murtaḍā, Qum
391) Ẓahar al-islām, Aḥmad Amīn, Cairo, Maktabat al-Nahḍat al-qāhira